

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY 1898.

DÖRPFELD'S THEORY OF THE GREEK STAGE.

For many years past Dörpfeld's book on the Greek theatre has been expected with the greatest curiosity. Before its publication his theory of the Greek stage had only been revealed in a partial and fragmentary manner, in the course of incidental papers and reviews. We were never sure whether we had the whole theory before us, or whether we knew all the evidence which was to be brought forward in support of it. His book has now been published. The theory is clearly expounded, and carefully worked out in all its details. We are now therefore in possession of all the facts which are necessary for the purpose of coming to a decision about it. Under these circumstances a fresh discussion of this question about the Greek stage may be interesting and profitable. My purpose in the present paper is to state briefly the main arguments which are to be brought forward on both sides of the question; and to explain the grounds on which, as it seems to me, the new theory must be regarded as untenable. In dealing with this subject it will be convenient to divide the period covered by the Greek drama into two parts, and to consider first the later period, from about 300 B.C. onwards; and then to return to the earlier period, that of the fourth and fifth centuries B.C. The evidence in the two cases is somewhat different, and will be more clearly understood if taken separately.

I.

First then as to the later period. The excavations of various Greek theatres during
NO. CII. VOL. XII.

the last ten or fifteen years have now given us a fairly clear idea as to the shape and structure of the stage-buildings throughout this period. We now know that from the beginning of the third century onwards the stage-buildings in every Greek theatre consisted of a long rectangular structure, and that in front of it there was a narrow platform about 12 feet high and 10 feet deep. This platform was called the 'proscenion,' as is proved by an inscription at Oropus. It was adorned in front with columns supporting an entablature. In the third century it appears to have been still made of wood. But in the course of the second and first centuries a stone proscenium was substituted for the old wooden ones in almost every theatre. The question now arises, What was the purpose of this proscenium, this long platform about 12 feet high and 10 feet deep, which we find in all Greek theatres after the end of the fourth century? Here we naturally turn to Vitruvius, who wrote a book about architecture towards the end of the first century B.C., and in the course of it gave a detailed description of Greek and Roman theatres. Vitruvius tells us (v. 6 and 7) that every Greek theatre has a stage, and that this stage is from 10 to 12 feet high and 10 feet deep. Its narrowness is due to the fact that it is only used by the actors in tragedy and comedy; all other performers appear in the orchestra. He adds that the Roman stage is much lower and much deeper, and this for two reasons. It had to be deeper, because all the performers appeared upon it. It had to be lower, because in a Roman theatre the spectators sat

in the orchestra, and would not therefore have been able to see over the top of a twelve-foot stage. Here then we seem to have a clear and final answer to our question. The proscenium which we find in all Greek theatres after about 300 B.C. must have been a stage. It answers exactly to the description in Vitruvius. Dörpfeld however takes another view. He says Vitruvius was mistaken, and that the Greek proscenium was not a stage but a background. It represented the palace or building before which the action was taking place. Actors and chorus stood in front of it, in the orchestra. The lofty stage-buildings above and behind it merely represented the sky. Now this theory seems to me impossible. It is absurd to suppose that Vitruvius was mistaken. He was a professional architect writing about his own special subject, and writing at the very time when many of these proscenia were being erected. His remark about the Greek stage is not introduced as an *obiter dictum*, but is made the basis of the distinction which he draws between Greek and Roman theatres. He had evidently therefore thought about the subject. But even if we suppose that he could make a mistake of this kind, even if we suppose that he had never been in Greece, and never seen a Greek play acted there, still it is impossible that such an absurd error should have remained uncorrected in his book. The connection between Rome and Greece was so intimate, that there must have been thousands of people in Rome who had seen Greek plays performed, and knew how it was done. If Vitruvius had made this absurd blunder, some one would have been sure to point it out to him, and he would have had it corrected.

I think then that the two facts already mentioned—first, the fact that Vitruvius tells us that every Greek theatre should possess a stage of a certain height, and, secondly, the fact that all Greek theatres after about 300 B.C. are found to possess a stage corresponding exactly to his description—I think these two facts are sufficient in themselves to decide the whole question. But there is no lack of further evidence. Various writers of this later period may be cited as witnesses. Pollux, in his description of the Greek theatre, says that 'the stage is appropriated to the actors, the orchestra to the chorus' (iv. 123 καὶ σκηνὴ μὲν ὑποκριτῶν ἴδιον, ἡ δὲ ὀρχήστρα τοῦ χοροῦ). Later on he says that the actors, when they 'enter by the orchestra, ascend the stage by means of steps' (iv. 127, εἰσελθόντες δὲ κατὰ τὴν ὀρχήστραν ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνήν

ἀναβαίνουσι διὰ κλιμάκων). The scholiasts on the extant dramas often speak of the performance in a Greek theatre as being partly in the orchestra and partly on the stage. The commentator on *Frogs* 181 says that the scene must be 'either upon the logeion or in the orchestra' (ἐπὶ τοῦ λογείου ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς ὀρχήστρας). On 297 he says that Dionysus here appears 'not on the logeion but in the orchestra' (οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῦ λογείου ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῆς ὀρχήστρας). The scholiast on *Knights* 149 discusses the question why the sausage-seller should ascend from the parodos to the logeion (ἴνα, φησὶν, ἐκ τῆς παρόδου ἐπὶ τὸ λογεῖον ἀναβῇ. διὰ τί οὖν ἐκ τῆς παρόδου;). There are other scholia to the same effect, which it would be tedious to quote. Now in these passages from the scholiasts and from Pollux, the point to notice is this. They do not merely say there was a stage in Greek theatres, but they describe the performance as one partly on the stage and partly in the orchestra. Dörpfeld says they are all mistaken; that they lived after the Christian era, and were confusing the Greek theatre with the Roman. But this would not account for their mistake, suppose there was one. In Roman theatres all performances were confined to the stage; the orchestra was occupied by senators and other distinguished spectators. How then can Pollux and the scholiasts have got this notion of a performance in which stage and orchestra were used at the same time? There was nothing in the Roman practice to suggest it. It can only have been derived from the Greek theatre. But apart from this, the suggestion that Pollux and the scholiasts were misled by their recollection of Roman customs is not a fortunate one. It implies that their writings were the result of personal observation. But no one can read a page of them without seeing that they were merely compilations from earlier sources. The scholiasts often mention their authorities, and these go back to Aristophanes and Aristarchus, and even beyond. Although then they wrote after the Christian era, their statements really represent the opinions of the old Alexandrian scholars. When they say that Greek dramas were performed partly on the stage and partly in the orchestra, it is evident that the Alexandrians thought the same. The testimony of Pollux and the scholiasts is really testimony of the third century B.C.

Another writer whose words appear to be decisive on this question is Horace. Horace in the *Ars Poetica* (278), in recounting the

dramatic reforms of Aeschylus, says that he 'erected a stage on beams of moderate size,' (*modicis instravit pulpita tignis*). Now it is true that Horace is often inaccurate in his account of the early Greek drama. It is possible that he had not much real knowledge about the reforms of Aeschylus. But one thing is certain, that he would never have included among those reforms the 'erection of a stage,' unless a stage had been a regular part of the Greek theatres of his own day. Dörpfeld, in dealing with this passage, offers two alternatives. He first suggests that 'pulpitum' means the 'stage-buildings.' But he cites no authority for such a meaning, and none is to be found. The word 'pulpitum' in Latin always means a stage or platform. Then, if the first alternative seems unsatisfactory, he suggests that Horace has made a mistake, like Vitruvius, in attributing a stage to the Greek theatre, and that he was confusing the Greek theatre with the Roman. But Horace, as we know, was for a long time in Athens, and must have often seen Greek plays performed. It is hardly conceivable, therefore, that he should have made a mistake on such a simple matter as the presence or absence of a stage.

Many other writers, ranging from the third century B.C. to the second century A.D., might be cited as witnesses on this question. But as they have often been quoted before, and the passages are now familiar to everyone, I will pass on to what is more novel and interesting—the archaeological evidence. The recent excavations of Greek theatres have brought to light several facts which bear closely on this subject of the stage. The evidence derived from this source appears to be as fatal to the new theory as is the literary evidence. One of the most convincing proofs is that afforded by the structure of the stage-buildings at Sicyon, Eretria, and Oropus. We have seen that, according to Dörpfeld's view, the proscenium was the background, and that the action of the play took place in front of it, in the orchestra. Obviously, in that case, the most important part of the stage-buildings must have been the rooms immediately behind the proscenium, or in other words, behind the back-scene. Now what do we find at Sicyon? We find that one-third of the space behind the proscenium consisted of solid rock. The Sicyonians, in order to save the expense of erecting a lofty auditorium, excavated their theatre out of the rock to a depth of about twelve feet. But they attached so little

importance, that they did not take the trouble to excavate the whole of this part. They left one-third of it as it was. It was only when they came to the first floor of the stage-buildings, the floor on a level with the top of the proscenium, that they provided a clear space from end to end of the building. Their conduct, on Dörpfeld's theory, was very peculiar. But the people of Eretria acted in a still stranger manner. They too excavated their theatre out of the rock. But they left the whole of the space behind the proscenium unexcavated. Consequently, at Eretria, the ground floor of the stage-buildings was on a level, not with the floor of the orchestra, but with the top of the proscenium. There could hardly be a more decisive proof that at Eretria the actors appeared, not in front of the proscenium, but on the top of it. Then there is the case of Oropus. Here the stage-buildings were built upon the ground, and the rooms behind the proscenium were originally open from end to end. But later on the Oropians proceeded to fill up the greater part of the space with earth, and left only a narrow passage immediately behind the proscenium. Such conduct is irreconcilable with the supposition that the proscenium was the back-scene.

Another proof is afforded by the height of the proscenium. Vitruvius says that it should be not more than 12 feet high, and not less than 10. As a matter of fact most of the proscenia which have been discovered are about this height. Sometimes they are more. The proscenia at Athens and at the Peiraeus were about 13 feet in height. On the other hand they are sometimes a great deal less. At Delos and at Oropus the proscenium was only about 8 feet high; the columns which supported the entablature in front of it were only 6 feet 6 inches. On Dörpfeld's view, these proscenia, with their architectural front, represented the palace or other building before which the action was carried on. But what are we to think of a palace about 50 feet long and only 8 feet high? The background at Oropus and at Delos, during the performance of a tragedy, must have been most peculiar. We should remember that the Greek tragic actor walked upon cothurni, which added about six inches to his stature. He also wore a mask with a lofty onkos which raised his height by another six inches. Consequently the Greek tragic actor, when equipped for the stage, can hardly have stood less than about 6 feet 6 inches. This being so, if Dörpfeld's view is correct, it follows that the protagonist

who took the part of the king at Oropus and at Delos must have been just about the same height as the columns which supported the roof of his own palace. When he made his entrance through the central door of the palace, he would have to bend his head in order to avoid knocking it against the cross-beam. Surely the theory is a weak one which involves such ridiculous consequences. If the Greeks had adopted a background of this absurdly diminutive height, without any reason for doing so, this fact alone would have been strange enough. But it must appear stranger still that, having once adopted it, they should proceed to add about twelve inches to the stature of their actors, in order to make the disproportion between the size of the actors and the size of the palace still more preposterous.

The reason which Dörpfeld gives for the lowness of the proscenium—the background, as he calls it—is as follows. He says that such proscenia were first erected at Athens in the fifth century, and were intended to represent an ordinary house of that period. But the ordinary house at Athens in the fifth century was, he thinks, about twelve feet high. To this theory there are several answers. In the first place, as we have just seen, some proscenia were only eight feet high; which is far lower than any ordinary Greek house, either at Athens or elsewhere. In the second place there is no clear evidence to show that the Athenian house of the fifth century was twelve feet high. From the remains lately discovered at Delos it appears that in the better class of houses there even the first storey was more than twelve feet. But granting, for the sake of argument, that an Athenian house of the fifth century was of the size which Dörpfeld supposes, what has this got to do with the size of the scenic background? The Athenian theatre, we must remember, was developed originally as a place for tragedy, and not for comedy. Comedy, at the beginning of the fifth century, was very little regarded. The background, therefore, must have been intended, in most cases, to represent a palace or a temple. But why should this palace or temple have been made the same height as an ordinary house? Moreover the proportions must have appeared extraordinary. A structure about fifty feet long, and from 8 to 12 feet high, would be altogether unlike any temple or palace. Dörpfeld replies to this that it is impossible on the stage to represent buildings as large as they really are; that in modern scene-painting the representations of palaces and temples are

much reduced in size as compared with the originals. This is quite true. But they are reduced to scale, and in proper proportions. A modern scene-painter, in representing St. Paul's, would no doubt have to make his representation much smaller than the actual St. Paul's. But in diminishing the height he would diminish the width at the same time. No modern scene-painter would produce a temple 50 feet long and 8 feet high; nor can we suppose that the ancients would have put up with a similar disproportion.

Again, there is the question as to the doors of the proscenium. If it was the background, it ought to have had three doors, the usual number in a Greek back-scene, as Pollux and Vitruvius tell us. But in most of the proscenia discovered there is only one door. In two of the proscenia, those at Megalopolis and Thespieae, there is no door of any kind. Even the single door, when it is found, is very narrow for the central door of the back-scene. At Epidaurus it is only 4 feet wide, at Oropus only 3 feet 8 inches, at Delos only 3 feet 3 inches. A door so narrow as this would be altogether unsuitable as the central door of the palace, and is quite inconsistent with the use of the *ecyclema*. When we come to the Graeco-Roman theatres, where the wall at the back of the stage has in many cases been preserved, there we find everything corresponding closely with the descriptions of the grammarians. There are always at least three doors, as we should expect; and the central door is of considerable width. At Termessos it is about 7 feet. As regards the absence of the requisite number of doors in the proscenium Dörpfeld gives the following explanation. These Hellenistic proscenia, as we see from the remains, consisted of an entablature resting on columns. The space between the columns was filled in, not with a regular wall, but by slabs of marble or wooden boards. Dörpfeld suggests that when doors were required, they might be provided *ad libitum* by removing the intervening slabs. But if three doors were regularly required in the dramatic performances, it is most improbable that they should not have been provided as a permanent fixture in the proscenium. It is most improbable that the Greeks should have put themselves to the trouble of opening out these temporary doors at each festival. In any case we can hardly doubt that if the proscenium had been the back-scene the Greeks would always have provided at least *one* permanent door, and would not,

as at Megalopolis and Thespiae, have erected proscenia in which there was no door of any kind. The absence of a door in these two places seems to prove conclusively that communication between the orchestra and the space behind the proscenium was a matter of no importance.

There is another piece of archaeological evidence which may be dismissed more briefly, as it has already been well known for many years. I refer to the vase-paintings found in the Greek cities of South Italy, and belonging to the third century B.C. These paintings represent comic scenes acted by the Phlyakes. The Phlyakes were a sort of farcical comedians, whose performances were not unlike those of the oldest Attic comedy. In many of these paintings they are represented as acting on a stage. In some cases the stage is a rude erection of wood. In other cases it is an elaborate structure, nine or ten feet high, and with columns in front, just like the proscenia which we have been discussing. Often there is a flight of steps leading down to the orchestra. In one case the action is taking place partly on the stage and partly in the orchestra. One of the actors is represented as actually ascending the steps to the stage. This evidence seems to prove beyond a doubt that in the Greek cities of South Italy, during the third century B.C., performances were sometimes given in theatres with a tall stage, and that both stage and orchestra were employed for the purpose, and were connected by steps. Dörpfeld now admits that this was the case. But he contends that the arrangement was an exceptional one, intended only for these farces of the Phlyakes. For these performances, he admits, wooden stages were erected, and the exhibition took place partly on the stage and partly in the orchestra. But the regular dramas—the tragedies and the comedies—were performed solely in the orchestra. But all this is the purest assumption. There is not a particle of evidence to support it. It is altogether improbable that a different arrangement should have been adopted in the case of these farces, and in the case of the regular drama. Moreover, as we have already pointed out, in some of the paintings the stage on which the Phlyakes are performing is obviously a permanent erection, and not a mere temporary platform of wood. It seems certain therefore that the Greeks of South Italy, during the third century B.C., provided a stage for their actors in all

dramatic performances; and this being so, we can hardly doubt that the same was the case in Greece generally.

I have now mentioned the most important of the archaeological discoveries which seem to be inconsistent with Dörpfeld's theory. To enumerate them all would make this paper too long. The facts already brought forward, combined with the testimony of Vitruvius and the other ancient writers, are sufficient, I think, to prove the existence of a stage during the period we are discussing. I will now consider the reasons which induce Dörpfeld, in spite of this apparently overwhelming evidence, to deny the existence of such a stage. And first of all it is necessary to bear in mind this fact, that by the beginning of the third century the Greek drama had altered considerably in character. The chorus had become a mere shadow of its former self. It was often discarded altogether. When retained, its functions were practically confined to singing choral interludes between the successive acts. It had no longer any real share in the action of the play. Apparently it seldom or never appeared upon the stage. Pollux and Vitruvius both say that the stage was confined to the actors, and that the chorus remained in the orchestra. We may ask, what was done in the case of reproductions of the old plays of the fifth century. The only old plays reproduced at this time were those of Sophocles and Euripides. When their tragedies were revived, the text was probably rearranged so as to reduce the choral part to a series of mere interludes. We know for a fact, on the testimony of Dion Chrysostomus, that the same sort of thing was done in the first century A.D.; and we may therefore assume that it had begun to be done as early as the third century B.C. The fact that the chorus was occasionally discarded altogether in the third century is a proof that even when it was retained its part was an insignificant one.

To turn now to Dörpfeld's objections. He says that these proscenia of the Vitruvian type would have been too narrow for the performance of a play. But their narrowness has often been much exaggerated, owing to false calculations. None of them, as it now appears, were less than about ten feet in depth. But a stage ten feet deep and fifty or sixty feet long would be amply sufficient for the performance of a Greek play, when the chorus was confined to the orchestra. The fact has been proved by actual experience. Most readers of this

paper have probably seen the plays produced in the theatre at Bradfeld. The stage there is only ten feet deep and thirty feet long. Yet any one who has been present at one of these performances must admit that there was plenty of room upon the stage. Dr. Gray tells me that on one occasion, at the funeral procession in the *Alcestis*, as many as sixty people were brought upon the stage at the same time, and without any difficulty. It is clear then that the Vitruvian stage, which was just as deep and twice as long as that at Bradfeld, would have been large enough to accommodate both the actors and the chorus in an ancient Greek drama, and would have been more than large enough for the performance of a play in which the chorus was practically confined to the orchestra.

Dörpfeld further objects that these Hellenistic proscenias were too high to have served as stages. Their height, as we have seen, varied from 8 to 13 feet. No doubt a stage of this size would appear excessively large in a modern theatre. But in an ancient theatre the case was different. There were no spectators sitting immediately in front of the stage. The audience was excluded from the orchestra. Further than this, the theatres were of enormous size. At Athens the spectator in the top row of the auditorium was 300 feet from the stage, and 100 feet above it. To such a spectator the twelve-foot proscenium must have seemed a comparatively small object. In theatres of this kind, where the majority of the audience were raised a great height from the ground, it would obviously be an advantage to have the stage as high as possible, consistently with not spoiling the view of the people in the lowest tiers. As for the objection that the chorus would not have been able to converse with the actors, if they had been separated from them by so great a difference of level, this is answered by the fact already mentioned, that by the beginning of the third century the chorus had ceased to take any share in the dialogue, and merely performed the same sort of functions as the band in a modern theatre. There is also this point to be considered. The highest proscenium of which we have any trace was 13 feet, the lowest about 8 feet. If then it is urged that a proscenium of 13 feet would have been too high for a stage, we may reply that it is far more difficult to suppose that a proscenium of only 8 feet could have served as a back-ground.

Another objection of Dörpfeld's is that

in the existing proscenias there is no trace of any communication between the stage and the orchestra. Now such communication, as we have already pointed out, was seldom required at this time, owing to the exclusion of the chorus from all share in the action. When it was wanted, it was supplied by temporary wooden steps. Pollux (IV. 127) says that the actors, when they enter by the orchestra, ascend the stage by steps. Athenaeus, the writer on military engines (p. 29, Wesch.) speaks of the steps which were placed in front of the proscenium for the actors. Moreover steps of this kind are found depicted in old paintings, along with other theatrical accessories, such as masks and costumes (Wieseler, *Denkmäl.* ix. 15, iv. 5). In several of the Magna-Graecia vases they are represented in their place, in front of the stage. As to their existence there can be no doubt. Dörpfeld says further that if the stage was twelve feet high, the steps would have been so long as to project far into the orchestra, and produce an ugly appearance. But this result might easily have been avoided by placing the steps parallel with the stage. At Tralles, where there is a stage of the Roman type, but much higher than usual, such steps are actually found, lying parallel to the stage, and on each side of the door which leads out from the front wall of the stage into the orchestra. A similar arrangement might easily have been adopted in the Hellenistic theatres.

In support of his theory Dörpfeld brings forward an argument based on the theatre at Megalopolis. The arrangement of this theatre was peculiar. The place of the usual stage-buildings was taken by a large hall or meeting-place called the Thersilion. The front of the Thersilion was like an ordinary temple façade; and at the bottom was a flight of five steps, each about 13 inches high. To one side of the Thersilion was a long building, apparently called the Σκαυθήκη, and probably used for storing the scenic decorations. In this building are the remains of a low wall, running in the same straight line as the bottom of the flight of steps, and about the same length as the stage must have been. Dörpfeld supposes that this wall was used for working a scaena ductilis. He supposes that, when dramas were to be performed, a wooden scene-painting was pushed out from this wall immediately in front of the lowest step of the Thersilion, and served as a back-ground. The actors in front of it must have been on the floor of the orchestra.

But this arrangement appears to be impossible. If the back scene had been placed in the position he supposes, immediately in front of the steep flight of steps, the representation of dramas under such circumstances would have been little short of ridiculous. The actor entering from the back-scene would have had to come down these steps to reach the threshold of the door. At first little more than his legs would have been seen, at any rate by the spectators in the upper part of the theatre. His whole person would hardly have become visible, until he reached the lowest step. For a tragic actor to make his entrance in this way would have been far from dignified. Moreover, in plays like the *Hippolytus* and the *Alcestis*, where a sick woman on a couch had to be carried out, it would have been extremely awkward to have to carry her down a flight of steps as steep as those at Megalopolis. The *ecyclema* would of course have been quite impossible to work. Although then the *Σκανοθήκη* at Megalopolis may very likely have been used for the storage of scenery, it is clear that this scenery, when used, cannot have been put up in the place which Dörpfeld suggests.

Another argument against the ordinary theory is based by Dörpfeld on the remains of the theatre at Delos. The structure of this theatre was also very peculiar. The stage-buildings consisted of a long rectangular erection. In front of it was a proscenium of the ordinary type. The peculiarity consisted in the fact that this same proscenium was continued, though in a modified form, round the sides and back of the building. Dörpfeld argues from this that the proscenium cannot have been a stage, as it would be absurd to erect a stage all round the stage-building. But if there is any validity in this argument, it might be advanced just as effectively against his own theory. Supposing, as he does, that the proscenium was the scenic background, it would be equally absurd to provide a scenic background on all sides of the stage-building. But as a matter of fact, though the arrangement at Delos was peculiar, there is nothing in it which conflicts with the ordinary opinion about the Greek stage. It is true that the stage-buildings were surrounded on all sides by a raised platform; but the front portion of this platform differed considerably from the parts on the sides and at the back, and was clearly intended for a different purpose. In front it was an ordinary proscenium of the Vitruvian type. It was supported by a series of columns; and the spaces between

the columns were filled up with boards or slabs. On the sides and at the back, on the other hand, it rested on square pillars, and not on columns; and the spaces between these pillars were left open. It is evident therefore that the front part was intended to serve as a stage; the continuation on the sides and back formed a sort of portico or colonnade, and was no doubt designed as a shelter from the rain. Vitruvius expressly advises architects to construct porticoes of this kind close to the stage-buildings, for purposes of shelter. In the Athenian theatre the back of the stage-buildings was furnished with such a portico. The fact that at Delos this portico was continued round the sides of the stage-buildings, as well as the back, and that it was of the same height as the proscenium in front, is no doubt peculiar. It was apparently an architectural experiment. But it throws no light on the stage question one way or the other. The front part of the erection at Delos was just like an ordinary proscenium. If therefore the proscenium in other theatres was intended for a stage, it must have been intended for a stage at Delos.

The proscenium in a Greek theatre was also called the *λογεῖον* or 'speaking-place.' It is so called by Vitruvius; and the word *λογεῖον* occurs in Delian inscriptions as early as the third century B.C. This being so, we are naturally led to ask how this fact is to be reconciled with Dörpfeld's theory. If the proscenium was the background, and not the stage, why should it have been called *λογεῖον*, or the 'speaking-place?' Dörpfeld makes the following answer. He says that in Greek tragedies the gods used to make their appearance on the palace roof, or in other words, on the proscenium; and that it was therefore called the *θεολογεῖον*, and for shortness the *λογεῖον*. But this statement will not bear examination. There are several passages in the extant dramas which show that when the gods made their appearance on high, they appeared, not on the palace roof, but above it. Cp. *Herc. Fur.* 817 *ὑπὲρ δόμων*, *Eur. El.* 1233 *δόμων ὑπὲρ ἀκροτάτων*, *Ion* 1549 *οἶκον θεοδόκων ὑπερτελής*. There is also the scene at the end of the *Orestes*, where the palace roof is already occupied by Orestes, Pylades, and Hermione; and Apollo and Helen suddenly make their appearance above them, and are described as *ἐν αἰθέρος πτυχαῖς* (*Or.* 1631). In fact, there are only about nine instances in the extant dramas, in which the palace roof, or the roof of a house, is known to have been used by the actors. If then the proscenium

was really the back-scene, the top of it must have been called the *λογεῖον* or 'speaking-place,' because the actors did *not* usually speak from it. Nine instances out of forty-four dramas are not sufficient to justify us in regarding it as a regular speaking-place.

I have now gone through the most important of the arguments which can be brought forward on both sides concerning this stage question, as far as it relates to the Hellenistic period. Some points have necessarily been omitted, for want of space. But they would not affect the result very much either way. I think that, as far as any rate as the Hellenistic period is concerned, the evidence in favour of a stage altogether outweighs any considerations which can be adduced on the other side.

II.

I now come to the earlier and more important period, the period of the fourth and fifth centuries, when the drama was still in reality a choral drama. Of course the position of the chorus differed very much at different stages during this epoch. At the commencement of the fifth century it was all-important; during the latter half of the fourth century it had begun to sink into obscurity. Still, speaking generally, we may regard the fifth and fourth centuries as a time when the chorus still played a significant part. As a consequence the conditions of a dramatic performance were very different from what they afterwards became throughout the Hellenistic and Roman epochs.

Let us consider first what is the literary evidence for the existence of a stage during these two centuries. For the fourth century we have the testimony of Aristotle. Aristotle in many places (*Poet.* c. 12, *Problem.* xix. 15 and 49) speaks of the songs of the actors as *τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς*, as opposed to the songs of the chorus, *τὰ τῶν χορῶν*. Further he speaks of the actor's part as being played *ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς*. His words are *τὸ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν* (*Poet.* c. 24). According to the usual interpretation of these passages he means that the actors played their part 'on the stage' and sang their songs 'from the stage.' Dörpfeld however proposes to translate *ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς* as 'from the background,' and *ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς* as 'at the background,' and denies that these two expressions imply the existence of a stage. Now the translations which he proposes may be possible, as far as the Greek is concerned. But is it possible that the passages cited

could have had this meaning in Aristotle. Aristotle's words seem to imply clearly that there was some essential and conspicuous difference in the position of the actors and of the chorus respectively. But if, as Dörpfeld thinks, they all performed together in the orchestra, there would be no such conspicuous difference. It is true that the actors might, for the most part, be rather nearer to the stage-buildings; and that the chorus might, for the most part, be rather more distant from them. But practically they would be standing in the same place; there would be no pronounced difference. It seems to me that Aristotle's words are only explicable on the supposition that the actors appeared upon a stage, the chorus in the orchestra.

For the fifth century we have the evidence supplied by the use of the word *ἀναβαίνειν* in Aristophanes. In three places, when an actor comes on, he is said *ἀναβαίνειν*, though the action is supposed to be taking place on the level ground (*Knights*, 148, *Acharn.* 732, *Wasps*, 1342). It has been proposed in these places to translate *ἀναβαίνειν* as 'come on' and not 'come up.' But such a usage of the word is otherwise unexampled in Greek. Moreover, in one place—*Knights*, 148—it is proved to be impossible. Here Demosthenes cries out to the sausage-seller *ἀνάβαυε δεῖπο*, 'mount up here.' He then shows him the people, the markets, the harbours, and tells him he will be lord of all. But this is not enough. He says, 'You have not seen all yet,' and adds (169), *ἀλλ' ἐπανάβηθι κατὰ τὸν λεῖον τοδί*, 'mount up on to this table also,' and then proceeds to show him the islands round about. These words show conclusively that *ἀναβαίνειν* must mean 'mount up' in the previous passage, and likewise determine its meaning in the other parallel passages. They also render it probable that in two other places (*Wasps*, 1514, *Eccles.* 1152), where an actor leaving the scene of action is said *καταβαίνειν*, the reference is to the stage.

The evidence just cited from Aristotle and Aristophanes appears to prove that there was a stage for the actors in the fourth and fifth centuries, as well as in the later period. We have now to consider what was the size and structure of that stage. Here the chief evidence is that derived from the extant dramas. These dramas have been carefully ransacked during the last few years, and several treatises have been published containing every passage that can throw light upon the stage question. It is not likely, therefore, that

any new points will now be discovered. Much of the evidence that has been brought forward on both sides of the question is really of very little value. It depends upon a too scrupulous and literal interpretation of the text, or upon a forgetfulness of the fact that there is much that is conventional in all dramatic performances. For instance, when old men are approaching the palace and complain of the steepness of the way (Eur. *El.* 489, *Ion.* 727), this fact is supposed to be a proof of the existence of a stage. It is suggested that they enter by the orchestra, and that the ascent of which they complain is the ascent on to the stage. But if this was so, these old men must have timed their entrance very exactly so as to reach the foot of the stage just when they came to the verses in which they began to grumble about the ascent. There would be something rather ludicrous in the whole proceeding. It seems more natural to assume that their remarks had no reference to the stage, and that the steepness of which they complain was left to the imagination of the spectators.

It will be best then to disregard all evidence of this inconclusive kind, and to confine our attention to those points which really throw light on the question as to the relative position of actors and chorus during the fifth century. The following facts seem to be established. It is evident that the chorus sometimes entered and sometimes departed by the back-scene. Instances are not very common; there are only about six in the extant dramas; still they undoubtedly occur. It is evident, too, that the actors sometimes entered by the orchestra. They must have done so when they entered along with the chorus, and they probably did so when they entered in chariots or waggons. This gives us about ten cases where the actors apparently came in by the orchestra. They may have done so much more frequently, but these ten cases are the only ones for which there is any distinct evidence. On the other hand it was a common practice for actors and chorus to depart together through the orchestra. Many plays end in this way, such as the *Eumenides* and the *Septem*. In *Aristophanes* it is a favourite form of conclusion for actors and chorus to go off through the orchestra in a joyful procession. The general conclusion then is this, that it was not uncommon in the fifth century for the actors to enter or exit by the orchestra, and for the chorus to enter or exit by the back-scene. But when we pass on from these entrances and exits, and look at

the rest of the play, we find that it is very unusual, during the course of the action, for the chorus to come on the stage, and for the actors to go into the orchestra. The instances in which, apart from exits and entrances, the actors and the chorus can be shown to have come into physical contact with one another, are remarkably few. I mean such cases as when the chorus try to prevent Creon from seizing Antigone, or when the chorus of farmers in the *Peace* mount the stage in order to draw the statue of Peace out of the well. Opinions may differ as to individual cases, but the total number of instances does not amount, at the outside, to more than about fifteen. The conclusion we may draw from this evidence is as follows. There was nothing in the theatre of the fifth century to prevent the actors from moving into the place occupied by the chorus, and there was nothing to prevent the chorus moving into the place occupied by the actors. But except when they were entering or leaving the scene of action, they do not appear to have usually done so, but to have kept apart from one another.

Now what does all this prove as regards the stage? On the one hand it proves conclusively that the stage of the fifth century cannot have been as high as the ordinary Hellenistic stage. If the fifth century stage had been twelve feet above the level of the orchestra, there would have been the greatest awkwardness in actors and chorus passing from one place to the other. But on the other hand it does not in any way exclude the possibility of there having been a stage of some kind or another. If we suppose that the fifth century stage was lower and deeper than that of later times, and that it was connected with the orchestra by a long flight of steps, or by a sloping ascent, then the extant dramas might have been acted on such a stage without the slightest difficulty. Actors and chorus could easily pass from stage to orchestra, or vice versa. The fact that they so seldom come into contact with one another, except when entering or leaving the scene of action, is a strong confirmation of the view that there was a stage of some kind, and that it was reserved in most cases for the actors, while the usual place for the chorus was in the orchestra.

We have lastly to consider how far these results are confirmed by archaeological evidence. Unfortunately there is very little of this. Most of the stage-buildings of which remains have been preserved belong to the third and later centuries. But

we still have the foundation walls of the stage-buildings erected by Lycurgus at Athens about the middle of the fourth century. And the oldest stage-buildings at Eretria apparently belong to the same period. As the two buildings are very similar in shape, it will be sufficient if we confine our attention to those at Athens. The Athenian stage-buildings of the fourth century consisted of a long rectangular structure, with wings at each end on the side fronting the auditorium. These wings projected about 17 feet, and stood about 70 feet apart. Obviously they were intended to enclose the stage. The important point to notice here is this. When in later times, probably in the second century B.C., a proscenium of the Vitruvian type was erected at Athens, these wings were brought back about 6 feet, so that the stage which they enclosed might not be more than about 10 feet deep, the usual depth of the Vitruvian stage. The fact then that the wings of the old Lyeurgian building projected 17 feet instead of 11, appears to show conclusively that the stage of that period was considerably deeper than the Hellenistic stage, and that its depth was more like 16 feet than 10. But since it was deeper, it must have been lower. If it had been 12 feet high and 16 feet deep, the spectators on the lower benches would not have been able to see down to the back of it. We see then that the evidence of the oldest stage-buildings at Athens, as far as it goes, is distinctly in favour of the view that the early stage at Athens was considerably deeper and considerably lower than that of later times.

As to the exact height of this early stage nothing can be determined. Obviously the main purpose of the stage must have been to make the actors clearly visible to the audience, and to prevent the view of them being impeded by the chorus in the orchestra. A few feet of elevation would be sufficient to produce this result. Dörpfeld, it is well known, denies that the view of the actors would have been obstructed by the chorus standing in front of them. But if we look at the plan of a Greek theatre, it is clear that if the actors were in the orchestra, and the chorus stood in front of them, the chorus must have obstructed the view of a great many of the spectators. In fact we have ancient testimony to that effect. The tragic chorus stood in three rows. We are told that the worst and most ungainly choristers (the *λαυρόστατοι*) were placed in the middle row, because they were not clearly seen by the spectators. Yet however the

chorus stood, there could only have been one row between these *λαυρόστατοι* and the audience. If then the actors had been in the orchestra with three rows of choristers in front of them, the obstruction to the view would obviously have been very much greater. And it is important to remember that the spectators who would have suffered most by this arrangement would have been the occupants of the lowest tiers of seats. But these seats were reserved as seats of honour, and were confined to high officials or to distinguished citizens. Hence, if Dörpfeld's theory is correct, the distinction which the Athenians bestowed upon their leading citizens cannot have been a very enviable one. The benches which they assigned to them must have been the worst seats for view in the whole theatre.

Dörpfeld further objects that if we suppose a low stage at Athens in the fifth century, the history of the Greek stage becomes a very fantastic and peculiar affair. We have first a stage of five or six feet, then in the Hellenistic period it suddenly rises to twelve feet, then later on in the Roman period it suddenly drops to five. His own theory, he says, is much simpler. There was no stage at all till the Roman period, and then a stage of five feet was erected. But the figures given by Dörpfeld are quite fallacious. There was no sudden rise and fall of the kind he describes. We know nothing about the height of the stage during the fifth and fourth centuries. But when we come to the Hellenistic period, we find that the stage was not fixed at 12 feet, but varied from 8 to 13. There was no settled rule. Architects naturally tried new experiments. Different heights were tried in different places. Probably there was just the same variety and love of experiment in the fifth and fourth centuries. Again, when we come to the Roman period, we do not find that the height of the stage was suddenly fixed at 5 feet. Some interesting plans and measurements of certain Asia Minor theatres have lately been published (Lanckoronski, *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens*), which throw a new light on this question. Many of these theatres, such as those of Termessos and Sagalassos, were among the earliest Greek theatres to be Romanised. But we find that the height of the stage adopted was not, in most cases, 5 feet, but from 8 to 9 feet. Moreover the stage was not placed in the middle of the orchestra, as in the later Roman fashion, but remained in just the same place as the old Hellenistic pros-

cenium. The orchestra still formed nearly a complete circle. These examples show how gradual was the process by which the Greek theatre was Romanised. If we compare the Graeco-Roman theatre of Termessos with the purely Greek theatre of Delos, the comparison is most instructive. Both theatres are almost identical in size, structure and general arrangement. The auditorium in each extends round two-thirds of the orchestra; the orchestra in each forms nearly a complete circle. The stage-buildings stand well back from the auditorium. The front line of the stage at Termessos is in exactly the same position as the front line of the proscenium at Delos. The height of the stage at Termessos is about 8 feet, and the height of the proscenium at

Delos is almost exactly the same. The only difference of importance between the two theatres is this, that the Roman stage at Termessos is longer and rather deeper than the Hellenistic proscenium at Delos. Now the stage at Termessos was really a stage. There is no doubt about it. The upper parts have been well preserved, and show clearly what its purpose was. Since then the stage at Termessos is known to have been used by the actors, can we doubt that the proscenium at Delos, which stands in exactly the same part of the theatre, and differs only in being shorter and a few feet shallower, was also used for the same purpose?

A. E. HAIGH.

THE USE OF PLACE-NAMES IN HISTORY.

AN ILLUSTRATION.

In the attempt to solve topographical problems of antiquity, what may perhaps be called Geographical Tradition is one of the methods of research not infrequently employed, at least in addition to or in default of better. This Tradition, or the use of Place-names as a proof of the site of some event, has for instance been used as a favourite instrument in dealing with the well-nigh desperate topographical problems of the second Punic War. And indeed if ever a historian be justified in employing all the means at his disposal, good, bad, and indifferent, it is surely when these particular problems confront him and demand some attempt at solution. Controversy is the happy mother of a family of arguments of this kind. Thus local Tradition and local place-names have been recently involved to demonstrate the Little St. Bernard to have been the Pass whereby Hannibal crossed the Alps. They have been used to support the (to me) more than doubtful Sanguinetto site for the Battle of Lake Trasimene. And recently in studying the question of the site of the Battle of the Metaurus river I have been again and again confronted with this same question, viz: what is the value of this local Tradition? In the absence of many precise topographical details in our literary authorities for this battle, the question of the justification of the appeal to the place-names of the district becomes even

more urgent than in cases where, as in the Trasimene question, our literary information is perhaps but too plentiful. The district on both banks of the Metaurus teems with names of villages, of hills, of bridges, which might conceivably be dragged in to support some theory of the site of the battle. Four such sites at least have been suggested, two on the right, two on the left, bank of the river, between Urbania and the mouth near Fano. In three of these the neighbouring place-names may be urged as additional evidence. It is not my purpose now to discuss this question of the site. That perhaps I may hope to do later. But this which is really a question preliminary to such a discussion seemed to demand some attempt at an estimation of its value, to clear the ground before the main struggle, if this may haply be the result. Even 'finds' too may be partly included in this general subject of the value of Tradition, when all that is left to us is not the 'find' but only a traditional account of the locality of the 'find.'

It is hardly worth while to repeat here the literary account of the battle of the Metaurus, as given in Livy xxvii. 43-49 supplemented by Polybius xi 1-3, Appian, Hannib. 52, Dio-Zonaras, ix. 9, and various passages in such authors as Frontinus, Florus, Eutropius, Valerius Maximus and Ampelius. All put together, the information affords

much scope for topographical controversy in virtue of its deficiency. This much however is directly asserted. Hasdrubal's camp was pitched 500 paces distant from the Roman, possibly (this is a point of dispute), near the city of Sena. On his discovery of the arrival of Nero in Livius's camp (i.e. accepting the tale of the great march, which is quite another question and does not affect my purpose in this paper, though it does concern the topographical dispute,) Hasdrubal retreated in the night up the banks of the Metaurus, seeking vainly to find a ford. On being overtaken by the Romans next day he was compelled to fight, and after a desperate engagement Nero's strategy won the day for the Romans. Hasdrubal, seeing all was lost, charged the foe and fell fighting bravely. His army, save for a few survivors whom it was not thought worth while to pursue, was cut to pieces or made prisoner.

In the year 1613 one Sebastian Macci 'Durantinus' published at Venice a work in four books entitled 'De Bello Asdrubalis.' Book iii (pp. 34-56) is a comprehensive effort to supplement and correct the literary account of the Metaurus Battle by the use of local place-names. It is necessary to make the preliminary remark that Macci intended his work to be a serious contribution to history. He had previously published a disquisition 'De historia' which proposed to reduce the art of writing history and the principles of evidence to a scientific certainty of rule and demonstration, even as Aristotle had treated Rhetoric. And Macci's 'De Bello Asdrubalis' seems to have been written to exemplify his Theory. In his Dedication too Macci explains fully his intent is to fill a gap in historical studies and supplement the literary sources. After commenting on the meagre information supplied us by Livy and Polybius he continues: *Quapropter ego, cui potissimum tota haec Metaurensis regio ab summo Apennini dorso usque ad mare Hadriaticum probe esset nota, non parum semper dolui hanc tantam nostram provinciam...fecisse historiae jacturam; ita nempe scripta est ut per jocum quodammodo ad nos transmissa esse videatur.* Wherefore 'ad hanc unam Asdrubalis historiam ex vetustis monumentis eruendam omnes nervos intendi... Non discessi ab Livio, sed quae illi in hac re deesse sensi, ad historiae integritatem superaddidi etc.'

In fact, the author has set out in all good faith to give for the first time a full and complete account of the battle of the River

Metaurus, supplementing the deficiencies of the literary authorities by a use of local tradition, local names, local finds. This account I propose in the remaining part of this paper to give, though compressed and summarised, and for this reason: not because it becomes at times so amusing as even to raise the question of the author's good faith, were this not (as I have said) so clearly beyond dispute: but because it is by far the best illustration known to me of the method of this use of tradition and place-names to help to decide topographical controversy, and of the extreme danger and uncertainty of the whole proceeding. Perhaps it is not fair to argue 'Ab hoc uno disce omnes.' But I do think it a lesson and an amusing lesson which may teach the eager topographical controversialist not to place reliance on 'Traditional sites,' when the tradition or local place-name is opposed to, or even uncorroborated by, literary evidence. And also I hope it will be of some assistance in any future discussion as to the site of the battle.

The method Macci employs of argument from place-name to event is so evident from his actual account as to need no introductory explanation. I proceed then to give that account shortly, as an illustration of the use of place-names and tradition in history. Where I have been able to identify the places of Macci's time with those existing to-day, I enclose the modern name in square brackets, as also one or two remarks of my own. The rest is but an English version and a summary of Macci's own account.

The Roman consuls then (according to this author) were encamped at Sena. Hasdrubal's own camp however was on the Metaurus, 16 Roman miles away to the North. That only 500 paces separated the camps is clearly impossible, when we consider the size of the armies and the strategic abilities of the generals. 'Even if Sena could mean the district, and not the town, yet the boundary of the district to the north is the River Cesano, 3 miles from Sena. Thus if Livius had occupied the whole district, 13 miles would still have separated his camp from Hasdrubal's.' Thus the river, in any case, "unde aquabantur," was the Cesano. [It is interesting to note that this interpretation of 'Ad Senam' is at least suggested as early as 1613 in the annals of the controversy. Oehler, for instance, seems to think Tarducci invented it in 1888, vid. 'Der letzte Feldzug des Barkiden Hasdrubal,' p. 6-7.]

Hasdrubal advanced over the Metaurus

to make a reconnaissance, but, observing the increased numbers of the Romans, retreated again in the night. Next morning the consuls crossed the Cesano in pursuit. They overtook the retreating Carthaginian and forced him to give battle. This 'first battle' took place on the 'plain of Bastia,' situated on the coast south of the Metaurus and north of the Cesano, the Carthaginian rear resting on the former river. A level space for fighting was left free between the armies. This was afterwards called 'Maurotta' 'a superatis Mauris.' [La Posta Marotta is on the coast, 3 Roman miles north of the Cesano, and thus some 10 south of the Metaurus.]

Hasdrubal indeed had attempted to fortify a hill near the Metaurus, but, stayed in this attempt by Livius, was forced to fight on the

the Carthaginian right wing. In the excitement of the conflict first the respective centres were drawn into the fray to help their engaged wings, and finally the Gauls and Claudius to help their respective centres. From sunrise to midday the battle raged furiously, till at last the Punic troops gave way. Thereupon Hasdrubal 'existimans se, si se ipsum incolumem servaret, facile posse novum exercitum comparare, ac bello iterum Romanos infestare, se coepit recipere ex pugna ac fugam cum quamplurimis militibus in summos colles petere.' It is true that Livy says he charged the foe and fell fighting. 'Sed iudicio tam meo quam eorum omnium qui hanc historiam diligenter perpenderunt, fugam arripuit, atque in aliud tempus et locum magis opportunum, obitum suum distulit, ut constat ex-



plain without fortification of any kind. His left wing, the Gauls, he posted, not on a hill (as Livy and Polybius) but on the sea, 'non tam quod illis magnopere confideret, quam quod rebatur eos ab Romanis mirandum in modum pro nomine nationis timeri.'

Livy indeed says that the Gauls were stationed on a hill. But how can this be, when all admit that they formed the left wing of Hasdrubal's army, and that the Carthaginians fought in that part of the plain nearer Fano, the Romans nearer Sena? 'Ad sinistrum igitur cornu, ubi erant Galli adversus Claudium, nullus est collis, tota namque planities ab ea parte conjungitur cum mari.' It follows therefore that Livy wrote 'ex locorum ignorantia.'

Owing therefore to the Roman dread of the Gallic name and not to any obtrusive hill, the battle began between Livius and

pluribus monumentis, quae paullo infra suis locis a nobis referuntur.' [In fact so many place-names in the district claim henceforth Hasdrubal's presence as to leave him no room for a glorious and speedy death on the plain of Bastia.]

Thus Hasdrubal fled, but in his flight the Metaurus barred his way and he journeyed up the river in search for a ford. But the Romans pursued hard after, and compelled him to stand on a hill, called in after years the Mons Maurus 'ab ipsis Mauris in eo colle occisis.' [Monte Maggiore?]

Some of his men however succeeded where their general failed, and crossed the river. Here on the left bank they pitched two camps, one at Saltaria [Saltara], the other at Carthicoetum [Cartoceto]. For this is plainly Carthaginiensium Coetus. And here the fugitives seem to have pursued

a tranquil and undisturbed existence. 'Est autem Carthicoetum sub Fano, ab eoque leges accipit. Sed adversus Fanenses qui Romanorum coloni sunt, non secus hostilem retinet animum quam Carthaginenses quorum colonia Carthicoetum est olim adversus Romanos.'

Hasdrubal however has been left on the the Mons Maurus. The Romans surrounded this on three sides, but on the fourth, where this hill abutted on to others, there was left a way of escape. Driven therefore from this refuge after a fierce struggle which cost the Romans dear, Hasdrubal 'se recepit in alios eminentiores colles.' Hither also the Romans pursued and brought him once more to bay 3 miles distant or a little more from Mons Maurus.

So desperate was the resistance offered here, so memorable the struggle 'ut aeternum colli nomen dederit. Nam postmodum ibi conditum fuit oppidulum, quod a patrato belli facinore Mons belli fuit appellatum.' [M. Bello]. And by this time the Romans knew so well their foeman's skill in flight to the neighbouring hills, that they stationed troops on the surrounding heights to intercept escape. Thus they left the river valley open and gave Hasdrubal an opportunity which he seized. Escaping with the survivors of the fight from the Mons Belli he descended to the valley and crossed the Metaurus by a ford. But Hanno his lieutenant here parted from him and fled higher up into the hills towards the valley of the Cesano. The Odyssey of chase splits into two. The consuls, themselves pursuing after Hasdrubal, detached a squadron of horse to take Hanno. His fortunes we now follow first.

When Hanno spied the pursuing horse, he halted on a hill three miles away from the Mount of War to await their onslaught. But with them came thronging the armed peasants of the district to join the chase. Whereupon Hanno fled in hot haste to other neighbouring hills. Yet one thing he left behind him on the hill where first he prepared to stand, and that was his name. In after years a town was founded thereon named Urgeannum [Orciano]. For as the squadron parted from the consuls to pursue him, this was the order they gave its leader. 'Urge Annonem.' And still from the spire of the church of this place may be seen suspended by iron chains an elephant's tusk, found in the fields near by when the fight was done. [Surely this is unsurpassed of its kind.]

Meanwhile some Roman cohorts had been

sent from Picenum and the Cesano to take up a position on the hills to stay Hanno's flight. Here where they halted, a mile away from the Hill of the Pursuit of Hanno, another town was built in later years. 'dictum et felici auspicio Mondavium, quasi montem Avium, haud secus ac si aves ad-dixissent.' Destroyed by Alaric, it was afterwards rebuilt. [Ruins of Mondavio.]

But Hanno had fled to be again overtaken by the horse two miles farther up the Metaurus valley, on yet another hill. Here too a town founded in after years bore the name Barchium [Barchi] 'a Barchinis militibus ibi superatis.' Near this is a castle called in the Italian tongue Reforzium [Reforzata]. For here the peasants reinforced the horse. Thus with increased numbers they pursued yet again after Hanno towards Umbria. At last on a hill which rose some seven miles away he and all with him were overtaken and cut to pieces. So afterwards there sprang up here a great and rich city named Fractae, 'ab fractis Poenis.' [Fratte.]

Now we return to follow Hasdrubal's fortunes.

After fording the Metaurus he had barely reached the Via Flaminia before the consuls came up with him. Another stubborn engagement ensued, but fortune continued to smile on the Romans, who were elated already by their former successes. Hasdrubal therefore 'fugam Romanis minime opinantibus capit.' In commemoration of these events, 'for an eternal memorial of the Roman dead, P. Sempronius Tuditanus three years afterwards founded Forum Sempronii' [Fossombrone.]

Hasdrubal fled up the Via Flaminia, and outstripping his pursuers, reached the point where the roads divided and he had a choice of ways. One road—the Via Flaminia—led through the Furlo pass to the Umbrian great central plain. The other to his right followed the upper course of the Metaurus towards the Apennine chain and Etruria. Hasdrubal chose the latter, thinking thereby the more easily to leave the Romans behind him. The Furlo also was so narrow and dangerous a ravine and the river's banks were so precipitous, that though this was crossed by a bridge, the way was yet most unsuitable for an army in hurried flight. The bridge however was attempted by some African troops 'et nunc quoque Pons Maurus appellatur.' [There is no bridge in the Furlo cutting to-day.]

Hasdrubal, continuing his flight up the other river, the Metaurus, came 'ad parvum

Hospitium, situm in quodam fluminis tortuoso flexu, quod nunc vulgata lingua Hospitalectum nuncupatur. Here a road struck up to the hills on the right leading to Urbinum [Urbino]. But when the fugitive looked up the road, he saw that the cohorts of Urbinum had gathered in force and lining the ridge of hills prevented all escape. Forced therefore to continue up the river he crossed it by a ford, and afterwards came upon a bridge which he crossed, and stayed there seeking to break down the bridge to hinder the foe from pursuing. But a few of the speediest of the Roman horse rode up too soon and Hasdrubal fled all the quicker till he overtook the rest of his men who had gone on before. Then they came to the place called *Castrum Firmidianum*, vulgo *Firminianum*. [Fermignano.] This name however has nothing to do with these events, but is so called from the villa of a Roman citizen named Firmidius, 'as is proved by a very ancient inscription dug up here but a few days ago.' Here there is a bridge over the Metaurus, and between the town and the bridge an old storied tower, '*inexpugnabilis nisi aenea adhibeantur tormenta.*' This tower is now the property of the great-grandsons of a brother of Polydore Virgil of Urbino, '*rerum Anglicanarum historici elegantissimi.*' When Hasdrubal crossed the river here, certainly the bridge was in existence. '*De Turri non ausim affirmare.*' He crossed the bridge in question, hoping to reach Umbria. Also the Urbinat cohorts prevented any further progress up towards the mountains. Thus they kept the fugitives in the valley and made the pursuit easier.

[Then follows a long glowing account of and panegyric on Urbino—after which digression—]

Hasdrubal crossed the bridge therefore and marched for Aqualania [Acqualagna]. This is so far useful as showing that Tarducci's Fermignano-Acqualagna road was thought more easy at the beginning of the XVIIth century for travellers to the south than that over the Furlo.] But he had barely escaped one mile from Firmidianum when the Romans overtook him, fell on his rear, and forced him to fight. This attack the Carthaginians repulsed, and the Romans drew back and waited for reinforcements. They saw that the country was so far roused that Hasdrubal had no chance of ultimate escape. The Punic general indeed could but fortify a position on a hill at a little distance, in the breathing-space thus given him, and flee no further. Such good use

however did he make of his time that on arrival of reinforcements the Romans found his position impregnable. They therefore sate down before the hill and determined to starve him into attacking them.

Now indeed was the Carthaginian plight a desperate one. In vain the fugitives planned ways of escape. '*Deus permittit interdum meliores vexari ac saevissimis opprimi Tyrannorum iniquitatibus, quo acquisitae victoriae laetitia sit maior, ac tandem recognoscant Dei benignitate se gravissimis calamitatibus fuisse liberatos.*' When his provisions were finally exhausted Hasdrubal charged down from the hill upon the foe in the plain beneath as the day was breaking. When after a desperate encounter he saw the day was finally lost, he spurred his horse into the thickest of the foe and fell.

His body was recovered from among the slain and carried off by the consuls for burial in a suitable and conspicuous spot elsewhere. But the rest of those who had fallen in the fray were buried on the hill where they fell. And ever since the hill has been called the *Mons Asdrubalis*, and to-day the rustics name it *M. Asdrubaldo*. [? *M. Arcello*.] To the plain where so many noble Romans had fallen there came in following days many women to bewail their dead, and it preserves the name *Planctus Mulierum* to this day. Here too by the stream that flows at the base of the hill were found many years after a helm and a richly decorated piece of horse armour thought to be Hasdrubal's own, and now preserved in the Prince's Armoury at Pisaurum.

Still some remnants of the Carthaginian force had escaped, and fled over the river. But no sooner were they come safe to the opposite bank than the leaders fell out as to the more expedient way of flight. One band turned to the right and climbed a neighbouring hill—called the *Mons Brandorum* [*M. Brando*—] where, as further retreat was cut off by the Urbinat cohorts, they entrenched themselves. The others fled about three miles up the river and halted on the plain now called the plain of *San Silvestro*. Here they built a rampart which still remains, and is called the *Vallum Asdrubalis*. [This is the great piece of evidence for the *San Silvestro* site.] Others of them built another similar fortification just on the very banks of the river, and destroyed the bridge over it. This was called afterwards the *Pons Cratium* '*quia post dirutos arcus crates interpositae fuerunt ne eius usus intermitteretur.*'

All this resistance was useless. On the consuls' return to Firmidianum, troops were despatched which quickly put the refugees of M. Brando to the sword, while they themselves proceeded against the two camps in the plain of S. Silvestro and destroyed the garrisons after one final and fierce fight.

All that now remained was to build the Tomb of Hasdrubal on some conspicuous spot to commemorate their victory. On a lofty hill they built it, and this, known before as the Collis Silicis, ever after kept the name of the Mons Asdrubalis. [Clearly Macci found two hills bearing this name.] The Tomb was restored and amplified by the famous Roman architect P. Fuficius, and its inscription, though partly illegible owing to the wearing away of the stone, is still

preserved: 'Horum omnium vetustissima eius inscriptio satis luculenta atque elegans, licet in multis exesa, effossa inter Castelli rudera, fidem minime dubiam facit.'

Many and glorious are the monuments and buildings of the famous city and district of Urbino, but greatest among them is Hasdrubal's Tomb. Thither the princes come, and the Antiquarians are gathered together. 'Visitur hoc tam nobile tamque vetustum Asdrubalis sepulchrum, una cum propinquis propugnaculis, a summis Principibus ac viris antiquitatis rerumque gestarum studiosissimis.'

How much then may be argued from local Tradition and the use of place-names to demonstrate the site of the battle?

BERNARD W. HENDERSON.

Merton College, Oxford.

REPETITIONS IN EMPEDOKLES.

THE reader of Empedokles, as the text is restored by Stein, cannot fail to be struck by the repetition of certain phrases and lines. The recurrent use of convenient phrases is characteristic of the epic style which Empedokles affects, and in this way the repetition of many phrases is accounted for. The phrase ¹ ἀλλ' ἄγε, ll. 19, 74, 96 (cf. 130, 262), will serve as an example. The first half of ll. 36, 61, 76, and the last half of ll. 112, 239, 140, are other illustrations of what may be expected in an 'epic' writer, and deserve no special consideration here.

A second class of apparent repetitions may be dismissed with a word, namely the repetition of a line for emphasis, with distinct statement of the fact that it is repeated (e.g. ll. 60-62 repeated 75-77). It amounts to the same thing when a thesis is stated, and then repeated at the close of the discussion. In this way I explain ll. 66 and 72.

Thirdly, there are numerous passages that impress the reader as repetitions because they deal with much the same thought, although there is a studied effort to put this thought in different language. In ll. 173 and 248 the language of 67 and 116 almost reappears. Lines 69, 70 repeat the thought of 61-62 with intentional change of language. The fundamental thought of the poem is that all things on the earth are the

product of four elements moved by two forces. The three parts of this thought appear again and again, but with intentional variation in language so as to prevent a sense of monotony. The list of things on the earth appears in lines 40 f., 105 f. (= 124 f.), 252 f., 383 f., 421 f. The four elements are mentioned in different terms many times: 33 f., 78, 130 f., 187, 197 f., (200), 204 f., 211, 215 f., 265 f., 333 f., 378 f. These repetitions, like those of the last group, are examples of a literary device appropriate to philosophic poetry. By means of it the poet is able to enforce and bring home his thought without too much wearying his readers.

There remains another class of repetitions which are due, as I believe, to a wrong reconstruction of the text, and it is with the purpose of eliminating the repetitions which belong to this class that I have instituted this study.

105-107 = 124-126. Lines 105-107 appear in Simplicius 7v 33, 15 and 34r 159, 22, and their position in this connection is confirmed by the quotation of 104-107 in Arist. *Met.* ii. 4, 1000a 29. On the other hand the same lines after l. 123 are found only in Simplicius 34r 160, 6; the text here is somewhat uncertain, and the link with the preceding by the participle κτίζοντε is rather artificial. Simplicius had quoted these lines less than half a page back, and it seems to me probable that the lines were inadvertently

¹ I refer to Empedokles by the lines of Stein (Bonn, 1852).

repeated here—possibly instead of some similar enumeration of things on the earth.

94(-95) = 108(-109) = 114(-115). Lines 94-95 are the fitting conclusion of the preceding discussion of the elements, but they have no meaning after 107. They stand in Simplicius 34r 159, 3 at the end of a long quotation, and it is not unlikely that they were repeated at the end of the next quotation (34r 159, 25) by the error either of Simplicius or of some copyist. The last half of 109 reads like a gloss that has been incorporated into the text. A negative argument of less weight for the omission of these lines (108-109) is the fact that they are omitted Simpl. 7v 33, 17. The same lines appear in Simpl. 8r 33, 21. Here they are intimately connected with the two preceding lines, but their connection with the following lines is forced, and the following lines—as I shall hope to show—belong better in another connection. Accordingly I propose to identify 114-115 with 94-95 and to insert 112-113 before 94-95. The order will then be 90-93, 112-113, 94-95 (= 114-115). The insertion of 112-113 between 93 and 94 is confirmed by the fact that 112-113 form the natural response to 93, and give a fitting introduction to 94-95.

67-68 = 116-117 (cf. 248). Lines 67-68 appear in this connection several times in Simplicius, and indeed 70-73 appear directly after 118 at Simpl. 8r 33, 26. Stein inserts Simpl. 8r 33, 26 as his line 69. My proposal is to insert both Simpl. 8r 33, 25 and 26 after 68, in which case there is no reason for

regarding 116-117 as different from 67-68. So I would read 67-68, 118, 69-73.

These two changes in the text of Simplicius, which cut out several repetitions, rest on the interpretation of Simpl. 8r 33, 19. Stein breaks this passage after 33, 25 and inserts 33, 26 as line 69. I propose to break it at the point where the meaning halts, namely after 33, 22; the first four lines I would place after 93 as I have suggested in the last paragraph but one, and the remainder after 66, as I have suggested in the last paragraph.

134 = 138. Line 134, which consists simply of the word *σφαῖρον*, has no reason for existence; as the reference in Simpl. 258r may perfectly well apply to line 138.

3 = 228. The close resemblance between these two lines may be due to the restoration of 228. We may notice however *μερίμνας* (3, 45, 228) and *δείλα* (3, 53, 228, 343, 400, 441, 446) are favourite words with Empedokles, so that perhaps there is no reason to discredit line 228.

In conclusion I should like to suggest a slight emendation of line 85. The text of Simplicius at 34r 158, 24 reads *μετ' ὅσους* (so aE; DE *μετ' ὅσουςιν*); Preller suggests *γ' ὅσουςιν*; Panzerbieter, *μεθ' ὅλουςιν*. What is wanted is a reference to the four elements, with which Love works, though her activity cannot be discerned by mortal men. So I would suggest *μετὰ τοῖσιν*, since *ταῦτα, τὰδε, τὰ* are commonly used to refer to the elements in the whole poem. ARTHUR FAIRBANKS.

Yale University.

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.

I.—*Ingens* ONCE MORE.

REPLYING to Dr. Fennell (*Class. Rev.* July, 1897, p. 300), I would urge the following considerations against the derivation of *ingens* from 'an indeterminate preposition with the root of *gignere*, etc.'

(i) As to Form.

This explanation requires that *-gens* be explained 1° as a nomen agentis of the type of *mens*, or 2° as an aoristic participle, say *in-g(n)ens*, or 3° as a participle to a root *g-*, parallel with *gen-*. The first of these explanations is morphologically unobjectionable, the second is plausible, but the third is a form-type usually accompanied by reduplication. Bréal (in his *Dictionary*)

NO. CII. VOL. XII

does, to be sure, compare *indiges*, but the etymology of *indiges* has, as I shall submit below, been misunderstood.

(ii) As to Signification.

For all the above derivations of *-gens* we should expect a sense like 'growing up, increasing,' if in the prefix *in-* we have a preposition; but *ingens* means rather 'grown up, increased,' and there is some difficulty in this shift of meaning.

(iii) As to the Composition.

Here there is great difficulty to my mind, and this I hinted at when I called the preposition *indeterminate*. I find no such development of meaning in *ἐγγενεσθαι* 'to be innate,' nor in *ingenius* 'free-born,' and hence reject the preposition *in* for *ingens*.

C

If Latin has any cognate of *ἀνὰ* that cognate is *an-* in *anquirere*, *an-hēlare*¹ (cf. v. Planta *Osk.-Umb. Gram.* i. p. 97, Brugmann *Gr. Gram.*² p. 218, Bréal et Bailly *Dict. Etym. s.v. halare*).

In the above statement I have tried to set forth at its strongest the argument for the derivation supported by Dr. Fennell, as well as the other side. I need hardly say that the counter-arguments seem to me the stronger.

I also reject the cognation Dr. Fennell instances of *γίγας* with the *γέγος*-group, though that derivation is in current use (cf. Prellwitz *Etym. Wört. s.v.*). On the side of the signification *γίγας* meets its very best explanation when regarded as a doublet of *βιβάς* 'high-stepping' (cf. the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xiii. 226). The 'velars' were in all probability not labialised before *ā* (cf. de Saussure *Mém.* 119, n. 2, Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*² 35, Anm., and the author, *Proc. Am. Phil. Assoc.* 1895, p. lxvi., in answer to Bechtel's contention to the contrary in his *Hauptprobleme*, p. 354). If this be true **g-ā* would have given normally in Greek **γ-ā* that is in an isolated word like *γίγας*, while *βιβάς* was affected by *βαινω* and its group.

Dr. Fennell holds that there are no certain examples of Sk. *ā-* or Grk. *ā-* akin to words beginning in *m* followed by a vowel. He will, I take it, not object to my citing the initial gradation *nā^h-/n-* any more than to *nā^h-/n-*. All scholars agree without any prominent exception, so far as I recall, that the privative *a-* of Sanskrit and Greek is a weak form of *ne* 'not.'

Fick (*B.B.* v. 168, vii. 95), Bury (*ib.* vii. 80-, 338-), Bezzenberger (*ib.* v. 168 footnote) suggest a large number of cognations based on the phonetic change denied by Dr. Fennell. I agree with G. Meyer (*Gk. Gram.*³ p. 52 Anm.), that very few of these have any claim to probability. But some of them are, we must allow, very plausible,

¹ The derivation of *anhēlare* from a preposition with *hālare* is, I am convinced, erroneous. The root of Lat. *anima*, Grk. *ἀνέμος*, Sk. *ānīla-s*, is *an-*. As other 'disyllabic' roots frequently show in Sanskrit (*ā* 'from *ā*'?), I would connect *anhēlus* 'gasping' directly with Sk. *ānīla-s* 'wind' (cf. *ānīti* 'he gasps'). The *ē* of *anhēlus* shows the same riddlesome variation in colour (*ē* and not *ā*) shown by *ἀνέμος*; while its length as well as the *h* may well be of secondary origin—by association with *hālare*—or we may here have the result of an Aryan *ā* (?)

I am also not in accord with the derivation of *hālare* from a noun-stem **an-s-lo-*, even though this is a very neat phonetic feat. To me *hālare* looks very much like an extension of *hā*, the sighing interjection.

more particularly the following, all from Fick's first article.

{ *ἀγ-ā, āγ-ā* 'sehr': *μέγα* 'gross, sehr.'
ἀγαμαι 'bewundern, hochhalten': Sk. *mah-*
 verherrlichen, herrlich sein.²

Noreen (*Ungerm. Lautlehre*, § 31, 5) adds Sk. *mādhya*, Lat. *medius*... 'in der mitte befindlich': Germ. *untar* 'zwischen, unter-', cf. Sk. *ādhas* < **mdh-* 'unten.'

We can hardly refuse to consider that **n-sme* (or **ns-sme*), the base reconstructed for Lesbian *ἀππε* 'us', Sk. *asmā*, is in gradation either with *me-* of the acc. sg., or *ne-* of the plural stem (Lat. *nōs*).

The following examples of *nā^h-/n-* are accepted by Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik*, § 7.

(1) Sk. *ābh-ri* 'Hacke': *nabh-* 'bersten' (Fick, *B.B.* vi. 238, Hoffmann, *ib.* xviii. 287).

(2) Sk. *āsta* 'Heimat': *nas-* 'einkehren' (Bartholomae, *K.Z.* xxix. 438 Anm.).

(3) Sk. *aktū-* 'night': Lat. *noct-is* 'of the night' (Benfey, *S.F.* 3, Bury, *B.B.* vii. 338, Bartholomae, *ib.* xv. 20).

(4) Sk. *addhā* 'gewiss', Avest. *azdā* 'Gewissheit': Sk. *medhā* from **mazdhā* 'Einsicht' (Johansson, *I.F.* ii. 30).

(5) Sk. *abhṛā-* 'Wolke', Grk. *ἀφρός*, Lat. *imber*: Sk. *nābhas*, Gk. *νέφος*.

The above examples will convince the reader that a large number of scholars recognise the probability of the existence of the gradation called in question by Dr. Fennell.

It is altogether likely that *āγ-ā* is an acc. fem. adverb from a stem **āγ-* as Dr. Fennell explains. Still the loan-word theory is not a very cogent one, and there is nothing either to disprove the claim that *āγ-ā* is a neuter adverb of participial nature like *πᾶν*.

I submit again that the comparison of Lat. *ingent-* (from **ngent-*) with Sk. *mahānt-* presents fewer difficulties than either of the current etymologies.

II.—LATIN *mons*, 'PEAK.'

Cognates of the stem *mont-* have seemed to be lacking almost entirely. Wackernagel *K.Z.* xxxiii. 571 sq.) explains very attractively the word *μοῦσα* 'muse' from

² Accepted by Brugmann with a qualifying 'wol' (*Gr.* ii. § 575), and cited without expression of opinion by G. Meyer (*Gk. Gram.*³ § 448); disputed by the author, *Am. Jr. Phil.* xv. 427, footnote 1, on grounds no longer cogent if *ingent-* is a cognate of Sk. *mahānt-*.

**μοντ-ya* 'a mountain dweller, oread.' Wharton in his *Etyma Latina* s.v. *mons* writes a base *MONTI-* and compares *ΜΥΤΙ-* Ags. *mund.* protection, Eng. *mound*: 'refuge.' Just what his conception is I am not sure that I grasp from so abbreviated a statement. Perhaps it is that this stem belongs to the root *men-* 'think' and *mons* was first a memorial or grave mound, and then came to be metaphorically applied to a natural elevation of land. The implicit metaphor is not impossible, and may even have been natural if the Italians came from a flat country to Italy.

Wackernagel's explanation of *μῶσα* just mentioned would set the problem back of the Italic period, and it remains to see whether other cognates do not show themselves in a sense susceptible of a more direct connection with *mons*.

I propose to apply to *mōnt-* the gradation *mon²/m-*, and I further assume that **mnt-* would give *mnt-* while the latter might be in certain cases indistinguishable from *nt-*. Homer uses the adverb *ἀντάρρα* 'uphill' and *-arra* might be explained on the lines of our assumption. We may explain as further cognates O.H.G. *andī* 'brow,' O.Ir. *étan*, and, with generalised meaning, Sk. *ánta-s* 'end.' Our common use of the phrase 'brow of the hill' is guarantee enough for the relation of O.H.G. *andī* 'brow' to Lat. *mont-* 'hill.'

There is still another Greek word that suggests itself in this connection viz. *μενθήρη* 'brow,' not given in Liddell and Scott, but to be found in Prellwitz's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*. I still believe (cf. *Am. Jr. Phil.* xvi. p. 3 footnote 2) that the question of the *tenuis aspirata* in Greek is unsettled and that neighbouring nasals and liquids exercised an aspirating influence on the *tenuis* (spite of G. Meyer, *Grk. Gram.*³ § 207). Thus it seems to me possible that the root of *μενθήρη* is *ment-*. We might with so solitary a word operate with a vulgar aspiration, or fall back on the Boeotian verb ending *-vθη* = Attic *-vrai*, and suspect dialectic variation. If we may set up an Aryan stem *ma²nt-* 'peak, point' we may refer to it the Latin words *mentula* 'membrum virile' and *mentum* 'chin.' In Sanskrit the stem *mathī* means 'twirling stick.' Such a stick was pointed and twirled rapidly about in another bit of wood to create fire by friction.

Beside the stem *mathī* stands one entirely like it in inflexion, viz. *pathī-* 'road.' The latter is represented in Latin by *pont-* 'bridge,' and if *mathī* meant primitively

'point,' then Latin *mont-* 'peak' is its cognate, and has preserved the same flexional type.

III.—*Indigetes*.

The etymology current for *indigetes* (*indu* + *gen-*) is obviously of the popular variety, and may be read between the lines of Servius himself on Verg. *Georg.* i. 498: *patrii Dii sunt, qui praesunt singulis civitatibus, ut Minerva Athenis, Juno Carthagini: Indigetes autem proprie sunt Dii ex hominibus facti, quasi in Diis agentes.* Here, passing over the etymological *lusus* of Servius himself, we note that the Great Gods were *indigetes*. This is also seen in a passage from Macrobius (S, l. 17): *virgines vestales ita indigetant, Apollo Medice, Apollo Paean.*

Alongside of *indigetes* stand *indigetare* 'invoke' and *indigitamenta* 'book of rites, prayers,' and the relation of meaning between them, if *indigetes* be taken to mean 'home born,' like *indigena*, is very far to seek.

I propose therefore to divide our word *ind-ig-et-es*, and compare Sk. *yajatā-* 'holy, divine': the root *yaj-* 'honour, sacrifice to.' Thus *ind-ig-et-es* means 'divine, consecrated, deified.' In Greek we receive great support for this explanation in *ἀγίζειν* 'hallow by sacrifice,' and *ἐραγίζειν* 'make offerings to the dead or Manes.' The Greek preposition *ἐν-* is of course identical with *ind-* in *indigetare*.

It is an interesting phenomenon that in Sanskrit there is a *te-* suffix instead of a *t-* suffix and the development of meaning was doubtless from 'honoured' to 'honourable' (cf. Lat. *acceptus* which has passed from 'accepted' to 'acceptable'). The *t-* suffix is of course prevailingly active (but compare *ἀγνωτ-* 'unknown, not knowing,' *προβλητ-* 'thrown forward, springing forward,' and *δορικμητ-* 'spear-pressed,' Brug. *Gr.* ii. p. 368, § 123), and the *te-* suffix prevailingly passive. This furnishes us with the clue to the difference in the stems in Latin *ig-et-* and Sk. *yajatā-* which last has been assimilated to a past participle in regard of its suffix.

From the phonetic standpoint there is no difficulty in Latin: *ind-ig* from *in* + *iag-* shows the same treatment as *inicere* from *in* + *iacere*. The *d* of *indigetes* either comes in by way of popular association with *indigena*, or was patterned after metrical archaisms like *indalbare*, *indaudire*, etc. If we may judge from *inicere* the initial

syllable of **inīgetes* would also have been long by position. This factor too must have been of weight in the orthography of *indīgetes*, particularly as we know there was a vulgar or dialectic variation between

nd and *nn*, as in *tennitur* for *tenditur* (Terence, *Phormio*, 330).

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

ETYMOLOGICAL NOTES.

CONSUS, the god to whom the Consualia were sacred, is expressly stated by Varro and Dio. Hal. to be the same as Neptunus Equestris: in other words Consus was an ancient god of horses—cf. Tertullian de Spectaculis Cap. V: Exinde ludi Consualia dicti, qui initio Neptunum honorabant. Cf. old Slavonic koni, Russ. kon', horse.

Grādivus seems hard to separate from IUVE KRAPUVI (Iovi Grabovio) of the Umbrian Iguvian tables: the meaning seems to be 'the shouter' from the root √gra, found in Slavonic igrā, play, dance: √gra signifies 'shouting' vide Miklosich

Wbh. der Slav. Sprach. p. 95. This will tally with Juvenal's simile of 'Grādivus Homericus.'

The word viverra (a ferret), Plin. N.H. viii. 81, used in Pliny's time, as now, to chase rabbits, and imported from Africa for the purpose, is a loan-word brought by trappers from the north with the skins which they supplied to the Romans. The Slavonic word is vévera a squirrel: in O. Prussian *vaivaras* signified a weasel; cf. Miklosich p. 389.

H. A. STRONG.

ON THE QUANTITY OF NAMES IN -ινης

In my *History of Greek Literature* I marked the ι of *Λεπτίνης* long as contrasted with the short ι in *Αισχίνης*. I have been asked by several scholars to state my authority for this distinction, and am the more anxious to do so, as I now realise that it goes to some extent beyond the evidence.

The scansion *Αισχίνης* is proved by Theoc. xiv, 2 &c. For *Λεπτίνης* my authority was Fick *Griechischen Eigennamen* xxxv seq. After quoting names in -inos like *Ἑρμῖνος*, *Χαρμῖνος*, Fick proceeds: 'Neben-*inos* erscheint seltner die Nebenform -*ίνης*, -*ίνας* wie -*ας* neben -*ος*, -*εας* neben -*εος* auftritt.' He then quotes 14 names in -*ίνης*, -*ίνας* (not including either *Αισχίνης* or *Λεπτίνης*): e.g. *Καλλῖνης* (*Καλλῖνος*), *Λευκῖνης* (*Λευκῖνος*), *Πρατῖνης* (*Πρατῖνος*). The last case seems the clearest; *Πρατῖνης* being regular Doric, with the characteristic -*ας* = -*ος*. The name *Leptines* occurs, so far as I know, only twice in poetry. Archil. 70 Bgk.

Τοῖος ἀνθρώπουσι θυμὸς, Γλαῦκε, Λεπτίνεω πᾶν.
and Rhianus Anth. Pal. xii. 93.

*Ὦν δ' ἐπὶ Λεπτίνεω στρέψης δέμας, οὐκετι γνῖα.

The first of these is inconclusive: the latter tends in favour of ι, since the Ionic Genitive in -*εω* 'must always be read as one syllable.' (Weir Smyth, *Ionic*, § 428 cf. § 446: 'Ionic -*εω* is invariably monosyllabic.') For this reason I marked 'Leptines' in accordance with Fick's rule and with the apparent usage of Rhianus.

However, Rhianus is not quite conclusive: he may have taken an unusual licence with a name otherwise unmanageable in elegiacs, and have sought to justify himself by *Ἄλτρω ὅς Ἀελέγεσσι* in Φ 87; (cf. the late epigram in Weir Smyth's note l.c.) And as for Fick's rule it seems to crumble away upon closer examination. Of his 14 names in -*ίνης* -*ίνας*, I can find no single instance where the ι is certainly long, while there are two where it is short. These are *Μυρῖνης* (cf. *Μυρῖνος*, *Μυρῖνη*) in poet. ap. Ath. 32b, 132d, and *Σμυκρῖνης* in Menander's *Aspis*. Of course *Μυρῖνης*, as the name of a wine, and adjectival, may not be evidence for real proper names. *Σμυκρῖνης* rests upon an emendation of Bentley's (MS. *σμυκρὴν ἤ*), but if the form with Σ was used at all by the Comic poets (see the strong evidence in

Kock *ad. loc.*) the -w- must be short. They would not invent a name which could not be used in iambs.

Πυθίας is marked -iv in Pape's Lexicon, I suspect by a misprint, since in similar names Pape marks -iv. The name only occurs, I think, in Delphian prose inscriptions; e.g. Collitz 2023. If *Ἐρασινάδης* (-iv-) is the right form in Ar. *Ranae*, 1196 we may infer *Ἀλκινάδας* in Thuc. v. 24: but the variant spelling -ιδης is probably correct in both cases, and the patronymics come from *Ἐρασίνος*, *Ἀλκίνος*, rather than from *Ἐρασίνης* *Ἀλκίνης*.

The upshot seems to be that our evidence is at present inconclusive. The suffixes -ino- -ina- are well established in Greek proper

names (*Κρατίνος* &c.) as well as in words like *ἄγχιστίνος*, *κορακίνος*, *χοιρίνη* (Brugmann Engl. Trans. ii. p. 157 § 68): -ino- -ina- are common in adjectives (*δρύνος*, *φίγνως*, *ἀνθρώπινος*) and are found in such quasi-proper names as *Μυρρίνη* &c. We find conclusive evidence for *Αἰσχίνης* and slight indications in favour of *Λεπτινός*. Etruscan forms like *Caecina* may or may not be analogous.

May I at the same time correct a more serious error which escaped my notice on p. 398 of the same book? Galen is there placed in the time of 'Augustus.' It should of course be 'M. Aurelius.'

GILBERT MURRAY.

A THEMISTOCLEAN MYTH.

It has sometimes been asserted that myths may owe their origin or at least their form to works of art, of which the meaning was misapprehended. Such myths would form an interesting variety of the aetiological species. Hitherto it has not been easy to point to satisfactory instances of the variety.¹ Recent investigation offering us a curious instance of a myth which seems to owe its shape to a well known statue, it seems worth while to set forth briefly its character and history.

I can claim no merit of discovery in the matter. The credit of discovering the evidence belongs to Dr. Rhousopoulos of Athens; the application of the evidence to the question of the origin of a myth is due to Dr. C. Wachsmuth.² I have only worked out their suggestions in more detail in order to present an interesting discovery to a wider English audience.

In regard to the circumstances of the death of Themistocles at Magnesia we have, as is well known, varying accounts. Thucydides (i. 138) states that he died a natural death, though some asserted that he poisoned himself, because he was unable to carry out the promises he had made to the Great King. Thucydides must here refer to the tale which is alluded to in the *Knights* of Aristophanes (l. 83):—

βέλτιστον ἡμῖν αἶμα ταίρειον πιεῖν,
ὃ Θεμιστοκλέους γὰρ βάνατος αἰρετώτερος,

¹ Compare, however, Milchhoefer in *Ath. Mith.* v. 45; Goblet d'Alviella, *Migration des Symboles*.

² *Rheinisches Museum*, 1897, p. 140.

which shows that the belief that Themistocles had died of drinking bull's blood was accepted at Athens in B.C. 424, and had almost given rise to a proverb. Of later writers Cornelius Nepos follows Thucydides. But Plutarch and Diodorus both accept the tale of the bull's blood. Modern historians naturally prefer the Thucydidean story of a natural death. In so doing they follow the line already taken by Cicero (*Brutus*, xi.). That writer asserts that it was Clitarchus and Stratocles who invented the story that Themistocles sacrificed a bull, and receiving its blood in a patera, drank it and died. Cicero adds that this version was naturally preferred by later writers as more susceptible of rhetorical and tragical embellishment; and here he seems to express the truth.

Themistocles is not the only celebrated man who was said to have thus met his death. Among prehistoric heroes Jason and Midas thus died; among historic characters Psammenitus, and Smerdis the brother of Cambyses. Hannibal is also by some said to have committed suicide by drinking bull's blood in imitation of Themistocles. The earlier of these reputed poisonings can only have been vouched for by vague rumour. The manner of the suicide of Hannibal is probably an invention of the rhetoricians.³

It seems fair to assume with Cornelius Nepos, Cicero, Grote, and others, that the historic fact was, as Thucydides says, that Themistocles died a natural death, and that

³ See Roscher in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, 1883, p. 158.

the story of the suicide by drinking bull's blood was a myth. Let us then examine the myth and separate its elements. A myth may fairly be regarded as having commonly three parts, an ethical motive, an intellectual justification, and a body or form. The motive of the myth before us may be, as Cicero suggests, merely the desire to have a tale suited to rhetorical and tragical treatment. Or there may have been mingled with this, very Greek, motive, one more strictly moral, the feeling that one who like Themistocles had been a traitor to Greece, ought not to have died in his bed. Mingled with this ethical element are others of a more intellectual or rationalistic kind. Thucydides records, as we have seen, the explanation that Themistocles slew himself because he could not fulfil his promises to the Great King. Another explanation is given by Diodorus¹, that Themistocles induced Xerxes to swear that he would not attempt again to invade Greece save with him as general, and then committed suicide heroically, and so secured Greece from Persian attack. The two explanations seem alike to have arisen in the schools of rhetoric. We have a glimpse which suggests of how flimsy material much of Greek history is made up.

There yet remains for consideration the body or form of the myth. Why is Themistocles said to have sacrificed a bull and then drunk its blood? It is the more desirable fully to explain this form, because it was already fixed at the earliest time to which we can trace the myth, B.C. 424.

It is impossible that any one could drink bull's blood, and straightway fall dead. I am informed on excellent physiological authority that there is nothing poisonous in the blood of bulls. To drink hot bull's blood would be unpleasant, and might make one ill, but it would not be fatal. Pliny² writes 'Taurorum (sanguis) celerrime coit atque durescit, ideo pestifer potu maxime.' This is at the least a great exaggeration. It is possible that the popular notion of its poisonous character may have arisen from the use of the blood of victims by priests, first for producing a temporary inspiration, and secondly, as an ordeal.³ When used as an ordeal fresh blood or even less injurious substances might when allied with a guilty conscience prove fatal.

¹ xi. 58, 3.

² N.H. xi. 222, cf. xxviii. 147.

³ See Frazer, *The Golden Bough* i. 34. Pausanias (vii. 25, 13) mentions the draught of bull's blood as an ordeal to test the chastity of the priestess.

The belief that Themistocles took bull's blood as a poison, almost to a certainty arose out of the details of a statue of the hero erected at Magnesia, the place of his decease.

Thucydides (l.c.) tells us of a monument, *μνημεῖον*, set up at Magnesia in Ionia in memory of Themistocles. Cornelius Nepos gives us a hint of the character of this monument. It was a sculptural group, *statuae in foro Magnesiae*. In the Athenian *Mittheilungen* for 1896 (p. 22), Dr. Rhousopoulos of Athens publishes a coin of Magnesia, struck in the reign of Antoninus Pius, which almost beyond doubt gives us a trustworthy representation of this monument. It was in the form of a bearded statue of the hero, naked, wearing a wreath, holding in the left hand a sword, in the right a patera over an altar, while a bull lies dead at its feet. The identifying inscription, ΘΕΜΙΣΤΟΚΛΗΣ is added in the field.⁴ The statue is quite in the style of the earlier fifth century. It reminds us especially of the naked bearded figure at Munich commonly called a heroic king, but regarded by Furtwängler as Zeus,⁵ which dates from about B.C. 460.

Dr. Rhousopoulos sees in this statue a representation of the last scene of the life of Themistocles. This appears to me a mistaken view; and I do not hesitate to prefer to it the interpretation suggested by Wachsmuth, which I have worked out in more detail.

The accessories of the statue are intended to show clearly in what light Themistocles was regarded by the people of Magnesia, namely as a civic hero or *οἰκιστής*. The offerings which were brought to persons raised to heroic rank were libations, and a bull, usually sacrificed at an annual festival. The animal was slain at the tomb, and its blood allowed to run into a trench. The ceremony was called *βοῦν ἐναγίζεν*⁶ as opposed to *βοῦν θύειν*, the word *θύειν* being usually reserved for the Gods. Slain bull and patera were added, it would seem, to the statue, to show that Themistocles held heroic rank. But how natural and easy it was for stupid people, among whom myths frequently take their rise, to see in these same accessories allusion to the manner

⁴ The magistrate's name is ἐνὶ Διοσκουρίδου Γράτου.

⁵ *Meisterwerke* Pl. xxiii, xxiv: *Masterpieces*, p. 212.

⁶ See Hdt. ii. 44: Diodorus iv. 39. &c. Cf. the inscription in Kaibel, *Epigr. Graecae*, No. 461, *μεχρὶς ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἡ πόλις ταῦτον ἐναγίζεν*: also the inscriptions of the Diogeneion at Athens.

of the death of Themistocles, and thus to furnish an embodiment for the conviction that he must have met with a violent and a self-inflicted death. The very form of the myth as Cicero gives it, *hunc isti aiunt, quum taurum immolavisset, excepisse sanguinem patera, et eo potu mortuum concidisse*, seems to point direct to the statue as it stood.

Here then we have an excellent instance of the rise of a myth, not out of words misunderstood, but out of a statue misinterpreted. And a specially interesting feature is the rapidity with which the myth sprang up. Themistocles was banished about 471, after which he lived for several

years in Asia. The *Knights* was acted in 424. Within some forty years of the death of Themistocles, and during the lifetime of hundreds who had known him, this curious myth in regard to his death arose, and had become so generally accepted as to be almost proverbial. There is in some quarters a notion that myths in regard to historical persons take a long time to spread and find acceptance. One would like to know on what evidence this view is based. At all events we have in the myth before us an instance to prove the contrary of it.

PERCY GARDNER.

VARIOUS EMENDATIONS.

ARISTOPHANES, *Vesp.* 765 sqq.

- ΒΔ. ἄλλ' ἐμβαδὶ
αὐτοῦ μένων δικάζε τοῖσιν οἰκέταις.
ΦΙ. περὶ τοῦ; τί ληρεῖς;
ΒΔ. ταῦθ' ἅπερ ἐκεῖ πράττεται
ὅτι τὴν θύραν ἀνέωξεν ἡ σηκὸς λάθρα,
†ταύτης ἐπιβολὴν ψηφιεῖ μίαν μόνην κ.τ.λ.

The point lies in the awarding of petty punishments to petty crimes. Editors who have tried to keep ταύτης have explained (1) τῆς δίκης, which is far to seek, and, when sought, is hardly a satisfactory genitive, (2) τῆς σηκίδος. For the latter, the dative is a much more natural case, and hence ταύτῃ γ' of Blaydes. But, even admitting ταύτης ἐπιβολὴν to be capable of meaning 'a fine in her case,' what is to be understood with μίαν? The commentators say δραχμὴν. Yet this word is not (as in such idioms it should be) at once suggested by the context and by usage. Moreover, even if the plural δραχμῶν is in certain circumstances easily omitted with numerals, e.g. χίλιας, it does not follow that the singular δραχμὴν is to be omitted with μίαν. We can say in English 'I will charge him five hundred,' viz. 'pounds,' but we cannot equally say 'I will charge him one.' Such expressions are decided by use. Again, would a Greek master fine a slave 'only one drachma' as a paltry infliction for a paltry offence? In the land of the triobol the sum would be a large one to a slave, even if money-fines were likely in such a case.

If any word is to be supplied, it should rather be πλεγγὺν; but the truth lies otherwise. I feel convinced that we should read

βλαύτης ἐπιβολὴν ψηφιεῖ μίαν μόνην

'you shall vote one single application of the slipper.' ἐπιβολὴν then contains a neat play on the sense of 'fine,' and that of ἐπιβάλλειν πλεγγύς. For 'slipper' (not yet obsolete as a punishment) cf. βλαντώω; Lucian, *De Consc. Hist.* 10, παύμενος ὑπὸ τῆς Ὀμφάλῃς τῷ σανδαλίῳ; Terence, *Eun.* v. 7, 4 (1028), etc.

Theocritus, xiii. 8-15 (Heracles and Hylas).

καὶ νῦν πάντ' εἰδὼς, πατὴρ ὥσεί φιλον νῖα,
ὅσσα μαθὼν ἀγαθὸς καὶ αἰδοῖμος αὐτὸς ἔγαντο·
χωρὶς δ' οὐδέποκ' ἦς
ὥς αὐτῷ κατὰ θυμὸν ὁ παῖς πεποναμένος εἶη,
†αὐτῷ δ' εὖ ἔλκων ἔς ἀλαθινὸν ἄνδρ' ἀποβαίη.

There is no need to detail the suggestions hitherto made upon the last line. The exact sense required is not, perhaps, so certain as in the case of some other corruptions, but I think the following restoration satisfies all the conditions, most of the mischief having been done by erroneous breathings and an iota subscript. Read

αὐτῷ δ' εὖ εἰκὼν ἐς ἀλαθινὸν ἄνδρ' ἀπο-
βαίη

'and that, an image (copy) of himself (Heracles), he might turn out a genuine man.' αὐτῷ εὖ = ἐαυτοῦ. Hylas was to be an exact copy of Heracles.

[In the fragment of Eubulus *κυβενταί*, 1, 1

(in the MSS. of Athenaeus) one MS. gives *εἰλον*, but another *εἰκον*].

Theocritus, xiv. 51.

μῦς, φαντί, Θυνώνιχε, †γεύμεθα πίσσας.

The few who think that *γεύμεθα* may be a word, and that it may stand for either *γεγεύμεθα* or *γενόμεθα*, will perhaps shrink from altering into

‘*μῦς*’ *φαντί*, *Θυνώνιχε*, ‘*γεῦμά τε πίσσας*,’

but I hope the suggestion may commend itself to others. ‘The saying goes “a rat and a taste of pitch.”’ This is a sufficiently familiar way of quoting proverbs. Cf. ‘a fool and his money’; ‘the fox and the grapes.’

γευματε was first read as *γευμετα* and then ‘corrected.’ [Cf. MSS. of Xen. *Anab.* vii. 7 § 24 *ἦν τό τε ABD* for *ἦν τε τῷ cett.*, and Soph. *O. C.* 1105 *τὸ δέ L* for *δὲ τε*].

Theocritus, xxiii. 49.

*ὦδ’ εἰπὼν λίθον εἶλεν· ἐρεισάμενος δ’ ἐπὶ τοίχῳ
ἄχρι μέσων οὐδῶν †φοβερὸν λίθον† ἦπτεν ἀπ’
αὐτῷ
τὰν λεπτὰν σχοινίδα.*

φοβερὸν is without sense, and the inelegance of the second *λίθον* speaks for itself. Read

σοβαρῶ νέω (‘of the disdainful youth’).

See the context, *σοβαρὸς* is a *vox propria* in such connexions. Students of palaeography will find nothing surprising in the corruption of *νέω*, since *N = AI* and *E = Θ*. Thus Phot. and Suid. quote from Aristophanes the corrupt *φλει* for the *φρεῖ* of *Etym. Mag.*

Theocritus, xvii. 2.

*ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, καὶ ἐς Δία λήγετε Μοῖσαι,
ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον ἐπὶν ἄδωμεν αἰδαῖς.*

It cannot, of course, be proved that the expression *ἄδειν αἰδαῖς* is wrong. It is, however, very displeasing. The suggestion *κλείωμεν* is quite uncritical. I propose *αἴρωμεν* (AIP for AID) ‘extol.’

Longinus, *De Sublim.* c. xxxii. § 8.

τοῖς τοιούτοις ἐλαττώμασιν ἐπιχειρῶν †ὁμῶς αὐτὸ† Καικίλιος ἐν τοῖς ὑπὲρ Λυσίου συγγράμμασιν ἀπεθάρρηνεν τῷ παντὶ Λυσίαν ἀμείνω Πλάτωνος ἀποφύνασθαι.

Read *ὁ Μῶμος αὐτοῦ*. Caecilius can find nothing but faults in Plato.

Longinus, c. xxxiv. § 2.

καὶ γὰρ λαλεῖ (sc. ‘*Υπερείδης*’) *μετ’ ἀφελείας, ἔνθα χρή, καὶ οὐ πάντα ἐξῆς καὶ μονοτόνως ὡς ὁ Δημοσθένης λέγει, τό τε ἡθικὸν ἔχει μετὰ γλυκύτητος †ἡδὺ λιπὼς† ἐφηνδυνόμενον.*

Even if a reasonable meaning could be extracted from this sentence, the combination of *γλυκύτητος*, *ἡδὺ*, and *ἐφηνδυνόμενον*, is intolerable. Since *η = ε* in pronunciation, we may read with some certainty.

εἰδυλλικῶς ἐφηνδυνόμενον.

Longinus, c. xxxiv. § 2.

σκώμματα οὐκ ἄμουσα οὐδ’ ἀνάγωγα κατὰ τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἐκείνους †ἀλλ’ ἐπικείμενα.

It is admitted that *ἐπικείμενα* has no sense, and that Longinus would certainly not have said of ‘the classic Athenians’ that their jests were *ἄμουσα* or *ἀνάγωγα*. Read *ἀλας* for *ἀλλ’* and punctuate

σκώμματα οὐκ ἄμουσα οὐδ’ ἀνάγωγα, κατὰ τοὺς Ἀττικοὺς ἐκείνους ἄλας ἐπικείμενα, i.e. ‘seasoned with wit after the manner of the classic Athenians.’

Sophocles, *Antigone*, 519.

AN. *ὁμῶς ὃ γ’ Ἀΐδης τοὺς νόμους †τοιούτους ποθεῖ.*

KP. *ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὁ χρηστὸς τῷ κακῷ λαχεῖν ἴσος.*

For *τοιούτους* schol. marg. L. has *γρ. ἴσους*. Professor Jebb’s defence of *τοιούτους* does not convince me. An easy correction, exactly fitting the sense, is *τοὺς οὗς* (*suos*), which would almost certainly be corrupted by some MS. into *τούτους* when written **ΤΟΥΤΟΥΣ**.

Sophocles, *O. T.* 625.

Professor Jebb is clearly right in assuming the loss of a verse after

ὡς οὐχ ὑπέξων οὐδὲ πιστεύσων λέγεις;

I should suggest that the lost verse in retort was

ὡς οὐχ ὑφέξων τὴν δίκην παλινστομεῖς;

For the expression, and for the close resemblance in the shape of question and retort, cf. 547–555. The reason of the omission becomes obvious at once.

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 407 sqq.

ἡ βοθίους εἰλατίνας δικρότοις κόπαις
†ἐπλευσαν ἐπὶ πόντια κύματα
νάιον ὄχημα λυοπόροιςιν αὔραις
φιλόπλουτον ἀμύλλαν
αὔξοντες μελάβροισιν;

The construction ἐπλευσαν νάιον ὄχημα κόπαις is quite without parallel. Read ἐσπευσαν, 'made to speed.' The first syllable in the line of the corresponding strophe is long.

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 419.

γνώμα δ' οἷς μὲν ἄκαιρος ὀλ-
βου, τοῖς δ' ἐς μέσον ἦκει.

For these meaningless words the context requires

γνώμα δ' οἷς ἐνὶ καιρὸς ὀλ-
βου, τοῖς δ' ἐς μέτρον ἦκει.

= 'in the mind of whomsoever there is a well-judged limit in the search for wealth, to them it comes in due measure.'

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 856.

ἀνυμέναιος, ὦ σύγγον', Ἀχιλλέως
†ἐς κλισίαν λέκτρων
δόλιον ὄτ' ἀγόμεν.

Neither λέκτρων nor δόλιον can be said to have a construction. Nor was Iphigenia brought ἐς κλισίαν Ἀχιλλέως. The point is that she was brought 'on a crafty pretence of marriage with Achilles.' Hence read ἐπίκλῃσιν. For ἐπίκλῃσιν treated adverbially and yet joined with an adjective, cf. v. 566:

κακῆς γυναικὸς χάριν ἄχαριν ἀπώλετο.

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 895.

τίς.....
δοῦν' ἴτοι' μόνον†
Ἀτρεΐδαϊν φανεί κακῶν ἔκλυσιν;

But Orestes and Iphigenia are not the only two Atreidae left. Electra not only existed, but is remembered by Euripides, and mentioned in this play by the 'only two' themselves. Read Τλημόνοιν, which was the more easily corrupted since η=οι in pronunciation, and -μόνουιν would readily be separated off as an independent word.

Euripides, *Iphigenia in Tauris*, 910.

ἦν δέ τις πρόθυμος ἦ,
σθένειν τὸ θεῖον μᾶλλον εἰκότως ἔχει.

To begin with, the theology is very questionable. The divine power could hardly be said to depend on human zeal. Nevertheless he would be a bold critic who would meddle with the text on purely theological grounds. Remembering, however, that a fragment of Aeschylus (291) says φιλεῖ δὲ τῷ κάμνοντι συσπεύδειν θεός, and the modern 'Heaven helps those who help themselves,' we may, I think, suggest as more probable than σθένειν, the similarly-shaped word συνθεῖν.

Aeschylus, *Persae*, 676.

ὦ πολὺκλαντε φίλοισι θανών,
τί τάδε δυνάτα δυνάτα
περὶ τῇ σῇ δίδυμα †διαγοῖεν ἀμαρτία†
πάσαν γὰν τάνδε
†ἐξέφθινθ' αἱ τρίςκαλμοι
νάες ἄναες ἄναες.

This desperate-looking passage may be very simply cured by the insertion of C between O and E, a correction of accents, and the recognition of an idiom.

Read

τί τάδε δυνατὰ δυνάτα
περὶ τὰ σά, δίδυμα δι' αἶγος <ε> ἐν
ἀμάρτια
πάσαν γὰν τάνδ'
ἐξεφθίνθαι; <αἱ> τρίςκαλμοι
νάες ἄναες ἄναες.

= 'Why is this possible, possible, touching which was thine—that all this land should have utterly perished as a double penalty for a single sin? Alas! the...'

For the construction ἐξεφθίνθαι ἀμάρτια cf. *Prom. V.* 563 τίνας ἀμπλακίας ποινὰς ὀλέκει; Eur. *Troad.* 878 ποινὰς τεθνᾶσι, etc.

Aeschylus, *Persae* 655.

θεομήτωρ δ' ἔσκεν,
ἐπεὶ στρατὸν †ἐποδώκει

Later copies have †εὔ ἐποδώκει. No passage has brought forth in the way of conjectures greater monstrosities intended for Greek words.

A point never to be lost sight of in the *Persae* is the perpetual objection of the Chorus to the policy of Xerxes in trusting to a sea-force. Previously Persia had carried on all its operations by land, and they had been successful, but Xerxes has dared ἐσορᾶν πόντιον ἄλσος κ.τ.λ., and with

the direct result. The Chorus here again commends Darius for his better judgment.

Read

ἐπεὶ στρατὸν ἐϋποδ' ᾤκει

'when he governed an army sound on its feet.'

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, vi. 4, 24.

εἰ δ' ἐπιλαθέσθαι, ἔφη, βούλεσθε τὸ γεγεννημένον πάθος.

The sense is that of 'undoing' or 'compensating for.' Madvig's ἐξιάσασθαι does not belong to sober criticism. Read rather ἐπαναθέσθαι, 'to retract the false move.' The simple ἀναθέσθαι is common enough in this meaning, and ἐπι- frequently = 'back.'

Xenophon, *Hellenica*, iii. 2, § 18.

ὁ μέντοι Τισσαφέρνης τό τε Κύρειον στρατεύμα καταλογιζόμενος ὥς ἐπολέμησεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοῦτ' πάντας νομίζων ὁμοίους εἶναι τοὺς Ἕλληνας, οὐκ ἐβούλετο μάχεσθαι.

For the last words cod. C. has οὐκ ἐπολέμησεν. Does not this divergence almost certainly point to the true reading being οὐκ ἐπολεμήσκειεν, 'he had no taste for fighting'? The desiderative verb is glossed in the other MSS. and corrupted in C.

Herodotus, ii. 8, 1.

τῇ μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ἀραβίης οὖρος παρατέταται, φέρον τὰ π' ἄρκτον πρὸς μεσαμβρίης τε καὶ νότον, αἰεὶ ἄνω τεῖνον ἐς τὴν Ἐρυθρὴν καλομένην θάλασσαν, ἐν τῷ αἰ λιθοτομίαί ἐνεῖσι, αἱ ἐς τὰς πυραμίδας κατατμηθεῖσαι τὴς ἐν Μέρφι. ταύτῃ μὲν λῆγον ἀνακάμπτει ἐς τὰ εἴρηται.

It is a sheer impossibility that anything should run ἀπ' ἄρκτον πρὸς μεσαμβρίης. It may run ἀπ' ἄρκτον πρὸς μεσαμβρίην, or to a central point ἀπ' ἄρκτον καὶ πρὸς μεσαμβρίης. The only defence offered for the text is the forlorn one that πρὸς μεσαμβρίης = πρὸς μεσαμβρίην. But there is no instance of the genitive in Herodotus which cannot be readily explained as distinct from the accusative from a natural point of view of the speaker.

The cure lies in reading ἐπ' ἄρκτον. Herodotus regards the range as having its chief part southward and as 'coming to an end' in the north, near the quarries. It

then runs back at an angle (ἀνακάμπτει) toward the Red Sea.

[For confusion of ἐπ' and ἀπ' (which is very frequent) cf. Xen. *Hell.* iii. 29, where all MSS. give ἐπεμψεν αὐτοὺς ἀπ' Ἐφέσου, but all editors require ἐπ' Ἐφέσου, the sense being decisive.]

Herodotus, ii. 22, § 2.

κὼς ὢν δῆτα ῥέει ἀν ἀπὸ χιόνος, ἀπὸ τῶν θερμωτάτων ῥέων ἐς τὰ ψυχρότερα; τῶν τὰ πολλά ἔστι ἀνδρὶ γε λογίζεσθαι τοιούτων πέρι οἷω τε εἶναι, ὥς οὐδὲ οἶκος ἀπὸ χιόνος μιν ῥέειν, πρῶτον μὲν καὶ μέγιστον μαρτύριον οἱ ἀνέμοι παρέχονται...δεύτερον δέ...τρίτα δέ.....

For discussions on the passage see Stein. Rather than accept the supposition of a lacuna or some forced explanation, read, not

ΤΩΝΤΑΠΟΛΛΑ,

but ΤΩΝΤΑΠΟΔΗΛΑ,

i.e. τῶν τ' ἀπὸ δὴ λά ἐστι κ.τ.λ.; and, as regards arguments from which it is clear... that it is not even reasonable for it to flow from snow, the first piece of evidence comes from the winds...the second...the third....

[In ΤΩΝΤΑΠΟΔΗΛΑ it was natural to mark off ΤΑ as an independent word. ἀπὸ may follow its case in Herodotus.]

Herodotus ii. 25, § 1.

ἅτε διὰ παντὸς τοῦ χρόνου αἰθρίων τε εἶντος τοῦ ἡέρος τοῦ κατὰ ταῦτα τὰ χωρία, καὶ ἀλεεινῆς τῆς χώρης ἐοῦσης καὶ ἀνέμων ψυχρῶν.

This being plainly contrary to all reason, not to mention grammar, one 'edited' MS. has οὐκ εἶντων ἀνέμων ψυχρῶν, which many editors adopt. It is not, however, clear why οὐκ εἶντων should have fallen out. I believe the true reading was not καὶ but χήτι ('through the absence of'). Cf. ix. 11. Ἀθηναῖοι...χήτι συμμαχῶν, καταλύσονται τῷ Πέρσῃ. This word seems to have had the form χάτι also.

Herodotus, ii. 39, § 3.

σῶμα μὲν δὴ τοῦ κτήνεος δείρουσι, κεφαλῇ δὲ τ' κείνῃ πολλὰ καταρυσάμενοι φέρουσι.

Nothing can be added to the discussion upon κείνῃ itself. Rather read κοῖνῃ. The prayers are 'for the sins of the people.'

Herodotus, ii. 78, § 1.

περιφέρει ἀνὴρ νεκρὸν ἐν σορῷ ξύλινον... μέγαθος ὅσον τε πάντῃ πηχυαῖον ἢ τ' δέπηχυν.

It does not seem to have struck commentators as remarkable that the wooden mummy should be spoken of as 'about a cubit or two cubits long.' In plain, but absurd, English it is saying that the figure measures 'about eighteen inches or a yard.' An examination of the MSS. shows that four of them give διπλουν. The true reading is plainly δέκοντα; 'about eighteen inches or two feet.'

Herodotus, ii. 111, § 3.

δέκα μὲν δὴ ἔτεα εἶναι μιν τυφλόν, ἐνδεκάτῳ δὲ ἔτει ἀπικέσθαι οἱ μαντήιον ἐκ Βουτούς πόλιος, ὡς ἐξήκει τέ οἱ ὁ χρόνος τῆς ζημίας καὶ ἀναβλέψει...

The oracle is in *oratio recta*. That fact is of importance for the entirely unclassical active future ἀναβλέψει. One cannot, of course, absolutely demonstrate the impossibility of such a form, but it is no great boldness to suggest ἐξήκει τέ τοι (= σοι) ὁ χρόνος τῆς ζημίας καὶ ἀναβλέψει αἰ.

Herodotus, ii. 116, 1.

δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ Ὅμηρος τὸν λόγον τοῦτον πυθέσθαι. ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἐς τὴν ἐποποιήν εὐπρεπὴς ἦν τῷ ἐτέρῳ τῷ περ ἐχρήσατο, ἥ ἐς ὃ μετῆκε αὐτόν, δηλώσας ὡς καὶ τοῦτον ἐπίστατο τὸν λόγον. δῆλον δέ. ἥ κατὰ γὰρ ἐποίησε ἐν Ἰλιάδι... πλάνην τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου, ὡς ἀπηνείχθη ἄγων Ἑλένην, τῇ τε δὴ ἄλλῃ πλαζόμενος, καὶ ὡς ἐς Σιδώνα τῆς Φωνίκης ἀπίκητο.

It is unnecessary here to give and review the attempted explanations of the passage as it stands. Neither ἐς ὃ nor κατὰ has any sense. The purpose of this note is to suggest the reading

ἀλλ' (οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἐς τὴν ἐποποιήν εὐπρεπὴς ἦν τῷ ἐτέρῳ τῷ περ ἐχρήσατο) ἔξω μετῆκε αὐτόν ('he put it aside'), δηλώσας ὡς καὶ τοῦτον ἐπίστατο τὸν λόγον· δῆλον δὲ κάρτα· <καί> γὰρ...

Of course it is not necessary, nor desirable, to mark off the clause οὐ γὰρ as parenthetical, but it is done here to save words as to the structure.

Herodotus, i. 33 (Solon and Croesus).

ταῦτα λέγων τῷ Κροίσῳ οὐ κως οὔτε ἐχαρίζετο, ἥ οὔτε λόγον μιν ποιησάμενος οὐδενὸς ἀποπέμπεται, κάρτα δόξας ἀμαθῆα εἶναι,.....

The change of subject from Solon (ἐχαρίζετο) to Croesus (ἀποπέμπεται) is peculiarly abrupt in this instance. One 'edited' MS. has ἀμαθῆς, keeping Solon as the subject. Critics hardly require to be told that such an emendation is not emendation, but a makeshift device. The probable cure lies in changing the second οὔτε into ὅτε... 'and he (viz. Croesus)....' This is quite in keeping with Herodotean idiom.

[For the change cf. *Anab.* vii. 6, § 38, where A.B. give οὔτε for the ὅτε of the rest. There, as here, a preceding negative helped the corruption.]

T. G. TUCKER.

VARIA.

Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 8. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐγίγνετο Ἀπατούρια, ἐν οἷς οἱ τε πατέρες καὶ οἱ συγγενῆς σύνεισι σφίσιν αὐτοῖς.

It is somewhat grotesque that 'fathers' should be mentioned as a class by themselves and pointedly distinguished from 'relatives.' The Greek does not mean 'fathers and other relatives'; and, even if it did, there is no reason for specifying fathers separately. When we remember the character of the Apaturia as a festival of the phratries, can there be any doubt that for πατέρες we should read φράτερες?

* * *

Dem. *Phil.* 1. 22. πόθεν δὴ τοῖσις ἡ τροφή γενήσεται; ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο φράσω καὶ δείξω, ἐπειδὴν διότι τῆλικαυτὴν ἀποχρῆν οἶμαι

τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πολίτας τοὺς στρατευομένους εἶναι κελεύω διδάξω.

In this passage τοὺς στρατευομένους can hardly be right, because only a portion of the troops were to be citizens. Dobree thought of τοὺς συστρατευομένους, Spengel of πολίτας τοῖς στρατευομένοις παρέιναι. Probably we should read πολίτας τοὺς στρατευομένους <ἐνίοις> εἶναι, where the loss of ἐνίοις will be due to the -ενοις preceding. Ἐνιοι (εἰσὶν οἱ) is sometimes put thus in apposition instead of taking a genitive. Thus *Ol.* 3. 11, τοὺς περὶ τῶν στρατευομένων ἐνίοις: *Aphob.* A. 23 δσ' ἔνια μηδὲ καταλειφθῆναι παντάσῃν ἡμφεσβήτηκε: *Thuc.* 1. 6. 6, ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις ἔστιν οἷς: *Ar. Eth.* 9. 1. 1164 a 27, ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις δ' ἐνίοις: *Poet.* 9. 1451 b 19, ἐν ταῖς τραγωδίαις ἐνίοις. We find

such words as πολλοί, οἱ πολλοί, ἕκαστος, even οὐδείς, added in the same way.

* * *

Isocr. (*in Nicoclem*), 2. 45, εἰρήσομεν τοὺς πολλοὺς αὐτῶν (i.e. τῶν ἀνθρώπων) οὔτε τῶν σιγῶν χαιρόντας τοῖς ὑγιεινοτάτοις οὔτε τῶν ἐπιτηδεύματων τοῖς καλλίστοις οὔτε τῶν πραγμάτων τοῖς βελτίστοις οὔτε τῶν θερμμάτων τοῖς ὀφελιμωτάτοις, ἀλλὰ παντάπασιν ἐναντίας τῷ συμφέροντι τὰς ἡδονὰς ἔχοντας.

Θερμμάτων is the reading of the *Urbina*s and one other good MS. as against the μαθημάτων of the rest. It has had the fortune, rare with bad readings, to be defended by Cobet (*N.L.* p. 154, and *V.L.* p. 515), who refers to the Athenian ὀρνυγοτρόφοι as illustrating Isocrates' meaning, and it is adopted by Blass. But θερμματα is rather ludicrous after ἐπιτηδεύματα and πράγματα. Perhaps another word may be found, giving a better sense and also explaining better the *v.l.* μαθημάτων. Isocrates must have written τῶν θεμάτων τοῖς ὀφελιμωτάτοις. A word like θέαμα harmonises much better with πρᾶγμα and ἐπιτηδεύματα, and is confirmed by θεωροῦντες (48) and the μῦθοι which are said to have been made not only ἀκουστοί, but even θεατοί (49). Cf. Thuc. 2. 39. 1, θεάματος δ'... ἄν τις ἰδὼν ὀφελῆθαι. Isocrates could also write θεωρημάτων in the same sense, and that would account for the ρ in θερμμάτων; but perhaps θεμάτων is the more likely.

* * *

Isocr. (*Panath.*), 12. 131, κατεστήσαντο γὰρ δημοκρατίαν οὐ τὴν εἰκῇ πολιτευομένην καὶ νομίζουσαν τὴν μὲν ἀκολασίαν ἐλευθερίαν εἶναι, τὴν δ' ἐξουσίαν ὅ τι βούλεται τις ποιεῖν εὐδαιμονίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῖς τοιοῦτοις μὲν ἐπιτιμῶσαν, ἀριστοκρατίᾳ δὲ χρωμένην.

Δημοκρατίαν... ἀριστοκρατίᾳ χρωμένην is an expression which no artist in words, such as Isocrates, would have thought of using. Read κεκραμένην, a word which his contemporary Aristotle employs once or twice in the same connection; *vide Pol.* 6. 3. 8: 8. 8. 2, ταῖς εὖ κεκραμέναις πολιτείαις. Cf. § 153, of this same oration: δημοκρατίαν... τὴν ἀριστοκρατίᾳ μεμιγμένην.

* * *

Pausanias, 1. 23. 10, 'Αναχωρήσας οὖν (ὁ Φορμίων) εἰς τὸν Παιανίᾳ δῆμον ἐνταῦθα εἶχε διαίταν, εἰς ὃ ναύαρχον αὐτὸν Ἀθηναῖον αἰρουμένων ἐκπλεῖσαι οὐκ ἔφασκεν ὀφείλειν τε γὰρ καὶ οἱ, πρὶν ἂν ἐκτίσῃ, πρὸς τοὺς στρατιώτας οὐκ εἶναι παρέχεσθαι φρόνημα.

No sense can be made of this, until we have altered παρέχεσθαι to παρέρχεσθαι, when everything becomes easy. Phormio had not courage to join his troops until he was clear of debt. In Pausanias there is no objection to παρέρχεσθαι: cf. for instance ἐρχόμενος in 1. 39. 1, and ἀνέρχεσθαι in 10. 30. 2. Ἐκπλεῖσαι cries out for an ἂν, which must be added.

* * *

Arist. *Rhet.* 3, 6; 1408a 9, οἷον τὸ φάναι τὴν σάλπιγγα εἶναι μέλος ἄλυσον.

For εἶναι read ἰέναι as in Plat. *Phil.* 51 D, τὰς ἐν τῇ καθαρῷ ἰέσας μέλος: *Lucius* 812 D, ἄλλα... μέλη τῶν χορδῶν ἰεσῶν. A trumpet can be said to *emit*, but not to *be* a strain of music.

* * *

Arist. *περὶ ὕπνου*, 2. 455 a 16, ἔστι δέ τις καὶ κοινὴ δύναμις ἀκολουθοῦσα πάσαις (ταῖς αἰσθήσεσιν), ἥ καὶ ὅτι ὄρα καὶ ἀκούει καὶ αἰσθάνεται: οὐ γὰρ δὴ τῇ γε ὅψει ὄρα ὅτι ὄρα, καὶ κρίνει δὴ καὶ δύναται κρίνειν ὅτι ἕτερα τὰ γλυκέα τῶν λευκῶν οὔτε γένει οὔτε ὅψει οὔτε ἀμφοῖν, ἀλλὰ τινι κοινῇ μορῇ τῶν αἰσθητηρίων ἀπάντων.

There is evidently something wrong about ἥ... αἰσθάνεται, and one or two MSS. omit the last καί. I should rather conjecture that we ought to add something, and read ἥ καὶ ὅτι ὄρα καὶ ἀκούει καὶ <γενέται> αἰσθάνεται. The loss of γενέται will be due to homoeoteleuton. The use of γένεσις in the next sentence points to the probable occurrence of the word in this; and Aristotle has it several times in the same connection with ὅψις and ἀκοή. For a somewhat similar omission cf. *Magna Moralia*, 2. 7. 1204 b 8, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ <ἰδεῖν καὶ> ὀσφρανθῆναι, where ἰδεῖν καὶ is Susemihl's tolerably certain restoration from the words that come a few lines further, ἐπὶ δὲ γε τοῦ ἰδεῖν καὶ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ὀσφρανθῆναι, and from the fact that ἰδεῖν and ἀκοῦσαι so constantly go together.

* * *

Arist. *Problem.* 33, 7, διὰ τί τὸν μὲν πταρμὸν θεὸν ἡγούμεθα εἶναι, τὴν δὲ βῆχα ἢ τὴν κόρυζαν οὐ; *H διότι ἐκ τοῦ θειοτάτου τῶν περὶ ἡμᾶς, τῆς κεφαλῆς, ὅθεν ὁ λογισμὸς ἐστὶ γίγνεται;

Did the Greeks regard sneezing as a god? They called it 'a bird,' Aristophanes tells us, but to personify it as a god was more in the Roman way. Read θείον, which is indeed indicated by τοῦ θειοτάτου.

* * *

Diogenes Laertius has not unfrequently written a wretched epigram on the philosopher whose life he gives us. At the end of his account of Socrates (2, 46) he thus throws in a little thing of his own, the second line of which has suffered, if the verses of Diogenes could suffer, from the hand of a copyist:

πίνε νυν ἐν Διὸς ὦν, ὦ Σώκράτης· ἥ σε γὰρ ὄντως
καὶ σοφὸν εἶπε θεός, καὶ θεὸς ἡ σοφία. κ.τ.λ.

The first line makes it clear that in the second he wrote καὶ σοφὸν εἶπε θεὸς καὶ θεὸν ἡ σοφία. The god declared Socrates wise and his wisdom declared him a god. This is so palpable that it has no doubt been pointed out before. The reverse blunder occurs 2, 100 where φῆς δ' εἶναι θεός is written for φῆς δ' εἶναι θεόν.

* * *

Plat. *Phaedo*, 82 D, ἐκείνοι, οἷς τι μέλει τῆς ἐαυτῶν ψυχῆς ἀλλὰ μὴ σώματι (or σώματα) πλάττοντες ζῶσι κ.τ.λ. Heindorf's σώματι λατρεύοντες, adopted by Schanz, is at present the only plausible emendation of this passage, but it would appear from Ast's *Lexicon* that λατρεία does not occur in Plato and that λατρεία is only used by him in its proper religious sense (*Apol.* 23 C: *Phaedr.* 244 E). Perhaps ὑπηρετοῦντες is the word that he used here.

* * *

Athenaeus, 507 C, Σωκράτης...ἐνύπνιον ἔφησεν ἑωρακέαι πλειόνων παρόντων· δοκεῖν γὰρ ἔφη τὸν Πλάτωνα κορώνην γενόμενον ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν μου ἀναπηδῆσαντα τὸ φαλακρόν μου κατασκαριφᾶν καὶ κρώζειν περιβλέπουσαν.

Kaibel omits μου in both places as *ab epitomatore additum*. A much safer and more obvious change is to substitute ἐδόκουν for δοκεῖν. It is the regular word in telling a dream, e.g. *Ar. Vesp.* 15 ἐδόκουν ἀετὸν καταπτάμενον κ.τ.λ.

* * *

Herodotus, ix. 122, The Persians are said to have addressed Cyrus in words beginning ἐπεὶ Ζεὺς Πέρσῃσι ἡγεμονίην διδοί, ἀνδρῶν δὲ σοί, Κύρε, κατελὼν Ἀστυάγην, φέρε, γῆν γὰρ κ.τ.λ. The extreme awkwardness of

the words ἀνδρῶν δὲ σοί does not seem to have struck any editor before Herwerden, who attempts to emend the passage by inserting ἐθνέων μὲν before Πέρσῃσι. In this he seems to have missed the right track. The natural thing to say was that Zeus had made the Persians masters of mankind and had made Cyrus master of the Persians. This sense we can get by the insertion of one word, if we write the passage thus: ἐπεὶ Ζεὺς Πέρσῃσι ἡγεμονίην διδοί ἀνδρῶν, <Περσέων> δὲ σοί, Κύρε. I had arrived at this conclusion, I may add, before I knew that Herwerden had found fault with the words as they stand. Κατελὼν Ἀστυάγην must be either omitted with Gomperz or altered to the dative: the vocative—for it cannot be nominative—is ludicrous.

* * *

Thucydides, iv. 36, 3, καὶ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι βαλλόμενοι τε ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἤδη καὶ γιγνόμενοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ξυμπτόματι, ὥς μικρὸν μεγάλῳ εἰκάσαι, τῷ ἐν Θερμοπύλαις—ἐκείνοι τε γὰρ τῇ ἀτραπῷ περιελθόντων τῶν Περσῶν διεφθάρησαν, οὗτοί τε ἀμφίβολοι ἤδη ὄντες οὐκέτι ἀντείχον, ἀλλὰ πολλοῖς τε ὀλίγοι μαχόμενοι καὶ ἀσθενείᾳ σωμάτων διὰ τὴν σιτόδειαν ὑπεχώρουν.

So no doubt the passage should be arranged, if it is what Thucydides wrote: and its correctness is now supported by Mr. Hunt's transcript of the recently found papyrus. Thucydides, we must suppose, forgot that the words οὗτοί τε κ.τ.λ. were part of a parenthesis, and went on with ἀλλά...ὑπεχώρουν as though they were the main sentence. This may well have been the case. Yet in spite of the papyrus I would just suggest for consideration a minute change which may save the author's credit. Ἀλλά and ἅμα are often confused. Read ἅμα here, and the passage will run thus: γιγνόμενοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ξυμπτόματι τῷ ἐν Θερμοπύλαις (ἐκείνοι τε γὰρ τῇ ἀτραπῷ περιελθόντων τῶν Περσῶν διεφθάρησαν οὗτοί τε ἀμφίβολοι ἤδη ὄντες οὐκέτι ἀντείχον), ἅμα πολλοῖς τε ὀλίγοι μαχόμενοι καὶ ἀσθενείᾳ σωμάτων διὰ τὴν σιτόδειαν ὑπεχώρουν. The word ἅμα emphasises the combination of two causes that made the Lacedaemonians give way. They were much outnumbered and also they were much enfeebled.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

CONCESSIVE PARTICLES IN MARTIAL.

MARTIAL'S usage of the particles of concession has been sadly neglected by the grammarians, Schmalz, *Handb. d. Alterthumswiss.* II.² § 263, refers to the usage of Juvenal, but not one word does he say in regard to Martial. Draeger, *Hist. Synt. d. Lat. Spr.* II.² § 566 foll., Kuehner, *Ausf. Gram.* II., p. 960, Landgraf, (*Reisig, Vortles.* III. Anm. 427b), all omit Martial in their lists of the writers of the Silver Age. Martial, following the usual practice of the poets, does not by any means make use of all of the available particles of concession but is partial to only two or three of them. *Etsi*, which is very rare in poetry, avoided entirely by Horace and Tibullus, only employed twice by Propertius and twice by Vergil, is not used at all by Martial. *Etiamsi*, *tametsi* and *tamenetsi*, as one would expect, are not found in Martial, *quamquam* rarely a favourite with the poets, did not meet with favour either with Propertius or Martial, not being used at all by either of these poets. Martial employs *ut* with this force but once: II. 41. 4: *verum ut dixerit*; his favourite particles are *licet*, *quamvis* and *cum*.

Licet always appears in Martial with the subjunctive and, with but one exception, always with a primary tense. This word, though having a concessive force, was still felt to be a verb, and so a few examples of *licebit* are to be found. Draeger cites no example of such a usage; Haase, in a note to Reisig III, § 262 only Ovid, *Amor.* 2, 11, 53; Wagener (*Neue Formenlehre* II.³ p. 973) cites only Hor. *Epod.* 15, 19; S, 2, 2, 59; Lucan 7, 855; 8, 629; Claudian, in *Rufin.* 1, 196; Martial uses *licet* 54 times:

- | | | | |
|---------|-----|----|---|
| I. | 60, | 1 | licet intres. |
| II. | 1, | 8 | sis licet. |
| | 23, | 1 | licet rogetes. |
| | 70, | 4 | „ abluas. |
| III. | 6, | 5 | „ dederit. |
| | 30, | 5 | „ dicas. |
| | 81, | 5 | sis licet. |
| IV. | 16, | 6 | defendat Regulus ipse licet. |
| | 54, | 8 | lautior sis licet. |
| (10) V. | 19, | 7 | sit licet unum. |
| | 28, | 3 | licet vincas. |
| | 39, | 8 | licet fuissem, a sequence extremely rare (cf. Juv. XIII. 56). |
| | 51, | 6 | fidiculae licet cogant. |
| | 60, | 1 | allatres licet et lacessas. |
| | 65, | 13 | saepe „ numeretur. |

- | | | | |
|-----------|--------|----|-----------------------------------|
| VI. | 23, | 3 | licet manibus blandis instes. |
| | 49, | 10 | „ hoc velis negare. |
| | 51, | 3 | „ usque votes mittasque rogesque. |
| | 52, | 5 | sis licet placata. |
| (20) | 64, | 29 | sit placidus licet. |
| VII. | 51, | 13 | nolis licet. |
| | 97, | 5 | instant licet premantque curae. |
| VIII. | 8, | 1 | des licet. |
| | 28, | 15 | licet sint aemula dona. |
| | 44, | 2 | cooperis licet. |
| | 54, | 1 | licet tribuas. |
| | 59, | 12 | ardeat licet. |
| IX. | Praef. | 1 | licet nolis. |
| | 3, | 3 | „ fiat. |
| (30) | 37, | 10 | sit lusca licet. |
| | 38, | 1 | licet ludas. |
| | 91, | 3 | „ essent. |
| X. | 12, | 12 | redeas tu licet (= etiamsi). |
| | 68, | 11 | licet ediscas referasque. |
| XI. | 16, | 6 | sis gravior licet. |
| | 8 | „ | Patavina „ |
| | 52, | 17 | relegas licet. |
| | 98, | 17 | sedeas tu licet. |
| | 104, | 22 | Lucretia sis licet. |
| (40) XII. | 14, | 6 | nec sint saxa licet. |
| | 29, | 3 | Tu licet observes teneasque |
| | 82, | 2 | tu „ velis. |
| | 8 | „ | sint „ sordidiora. |
| XIII. | 2, | 1 | Nasutus sit usque licet. |
| | 3, | 5 | haec licet disticha mittas. |
| | 86 | | iste licet pungat. |
| | 88 | | sint lauta licet. |
| XIV. | 7 | | licet haec membrana vocetur. |
| | 8 | | nondum legerit hos licet. |
| (50) | 28 | | sit licet et ventus. |
| | 70 | | licet rodas. |
| | 55 | | caedas licet usque. |
| | 130 | | Ingrediare viam caelo licet. |
| | 208 | | Currant verba licet. |

Martial uses *licebit* also 6 times:

- | | | |
|-------|--------|-----------------------------------|
| II. | 81 | sit licebit. |
| IV. | 55, 28 | rideas licebit. |
| VIII. | 21, 11 | stent licebit. |
| VIII. | 64, | 5 sit vultus tibi levior licebit. |
| X. | 100, | 5 habeas pedem licebit. |
| XIII. | 54 | Cerretana mihi fiat licebit. |

Quamvis (a) occurs 15 times, is used only with the subjunctive and always with primary tenses:

- | | | | |
|------|-----|---|-----------------|
| VII. | 7, | 1 | quamvis teneat. |
| | 19, | 5 | „ cesserit. |
| | 69, | 8 | „ sit. |

VIII. Praef. 10 *quamvis scripta sint.*IX. 38, 5 „ *sint.*51, 4 „ *sit.*XI. 23, 5 „ *futuam.*43, 9 „ *iaceret.*108, 1 „ *possis.*XII. 29, 15 „ *caleant.*77, 11 „ *caverit.*XIII. 73 „ *esset.*81 „ *gerat.*XIV. 95 „ *rubeam.*120 „ *dicant.*

Quamvis (b) with a participle (rare in Classical Latin, Kühner *Ausf. Gram.* II. p. 960, Anm. 3) occurs 5 times:

V. 15, 5 *quamvis reverentia.*65, 1 „ *obstante.*VI. 58, 5 „ *lassa.*XI. 69, 11 „ *rapta*104, 15 „ *stertente.*

Quamvis (c) with an adjective occurs 3 times:

I. 62, 2 *quamvis tristior.*V. 52, 7 *quamvis ingentia.*X. 11, 8 „ *plurima.*

It will be noticed that Martial employs *quamvis* both with the comparative and with the superlative. *Cum* is used as a concessive particle 9 times and chiefly in the earlier books:

III. 27, 1 *venias cum saepe vocatus.*IV. 6, 3 *cum sis improbius.*13, 10 *cum fuerit, non videatur anus.*19, 1 *cum sit pupa.*2 „ „ *anus.*64, 23 „ „ *tam prope Mulvius.*73, 1 „ *extremas duceret horas.*

(this may also be taken as temporal)

VIII. 20 *cum facias versus ducentos.*XIV. 1, 4 „ *videat tam prope laevis.**Quantumvis* and *quamlibet* do not occur.

It is thus seen that the reigning concessive particle in Martial is *licet*, (54 times) and that next to this he prefers *quamvis* (15 times).

EMORY B. LEASE.

NOTE ON HOMER, ILIAD XIV. 139 ff.

Ἀτρεΐδῃ, νῦν δὲ πον' Ἀχιλλῆος ὀλοὸν κῆρ
γῆθεί ἐν στήθεσσι, φόνον καὶ φύζαν Ἀχαιῶν
δερκομένῳ, ἐπεὶ οὐ οἱ ἐνὶ φρένες οὐδ' ἥβαιαι.

So speaks Poseidon in the guise of an old man whose sympathies are on the side of Agamemnon. Hence there is no possible objection to the tone of ὀλοὸν, but only to the abnormal foot, a tribrach, which it produces in the fifth place in the verse.

At first sight one might imagine that ὀλοὸν had taken the place of an original λάσιον, as we find:—

B 851 Παφλαγῶν δ' ἡγήτο Πυλαιμένους
λάσιον κῆρII 554 ὄρσε Μενoitιάδω Πατροκλῆος λάσιον
κῆρ.

and in reference to Achilles himself there is the well known passage:—

A 188 ἐν δέ οἱ ἦτορ
στήθεσσι λασίοισι διάνδιχα μερμήριζεν

but apart from the doubt as to the suitability of λάσιον here, where the necessity for an

uncomplimentary term is fairly apparent, and it is certain, if only from II 554, that λάσιον is not such, it is impossible to understand why λάσιον should ever have been displaced by ὀλοὸν. I believe the true restoration is this:—

Ἀτρεΐδῃ, νῦν δὲ πον' Ἀχιλλῇ οὐλόμενον κῆρ
γῆθεί ἐν στήθεσσι, φόνον καὶ φύζαν Ἀχαιῶν
δερκομένῳ.

Here Ἀχιλλῇ represents Ἀχιλλῆι and the removal of this elided ι would be quite a sufficient motive to induce the later Greeks to substitute ὀλοὸν for what they would consider, erroneously of course, the synonymous οὐλόμενον—inserting the commoner for the rarer form.

The expression as restored has its exact counterpart in:—

N 494 ὥς Αἰνεία θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γεγῆθαι,

where there was no inducement to tamper with the dative Αἰνεία. It is a singular additional confirmation of Ἀχιλλῆι in our

present passage, that the vast majority of our MSS., all the best, although there is complete unanimity as to the genitive of the proper name, give in defiance of grammar *δερχομένω*, and not *δερχομένου* in l. 141. This peculiarity of construction, which is the exact reverse of the usual one, is defended by a very weak-kneed trio I 636, K 188, Ψ 206, which I recommend to the consideration of those who may be interested in the point.

Classen's interpretation of *οὐλόμενος* needs no defence, but the coincidence of the Shakespearian use of 'shrewd' is worth a moment's notice. The 'Beshrew my heart,' of Juliet's nurse approximates very closely to *οὐλόμενον κῆρ* here. Oddly enough if we wanted an equivalent of the somewhat

remote modern use of 'shrewd' we have it in *λάσιον* according to tradition (Eust. τὸ δὲ *λάσιον κῆρ* ἀντὶ τοῦ πυκνῆς ψυχῆς, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ μεταληπτικῶς πυκνὴ καὶ συνετή). The only difficulty in the way of admitting this traditional explanation of *λάσιον* in the phrase *λάσιον κῆρ* is the above quoted passage, A 189, where 'shrewd,' 'wise,' 'prudent' would ill consort with the furious wrath of Achilles. It may be that *στήθεσσι λασίοισι* is only another example of the habitual carelessness of the later Greeks in maintaining obsolescent words. If this be so, I would suggest *στήθεσ' ἀλαστρείοισι*, 'in his indignant breast,' (cf. *νεικέω*, *νεικέω*) as an original by no means unlikely to have been corrupted into the vulgate.

T. L. AGAR.

ARISTOPHANES, *ACHARNIANS*, 709.

ὅς μὰ τὴν Δῆμητρα' ἐκεῖνος ἡνίκ' ἦν Θουκυ-
δίδης
709 οὐδ' ἂν αὐτὴν τὴν Ἀχαίαν ῥαδίως ἡνέσχετ'
ἂν,
ἀλλὰ κατεπάλαυσεν ἂν μὲν πρῶτον Εὐάθλων
δέκα,
κατεβόησε δ' ἂν κεκραγὼς τοξότας τρισχι-
λίους,
ὑπερετόξενυσεν δ' ἂν αὐτοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦς
ἐγγγενεῖς.¹

The difficulty of l. 709 is to understand why Thucydides, in the days of his prime, should have refused to 'put up with αὐτὴν τὴν Ἀχαίαν.' It is known (Hesychius) that Ἀχαία was an epithet of Demeter; and the cult of Δ. Ἀχαία is mentioned by Herodotus 5, 61; cf. also Plutarch, *de Isid.* 69 (ὡς ἐν ἁγεί οὐσίης). Hence the meaning is explained to be, either that he would not have put up with Demeter's presence (as being ill-omened), or would have shouted down even the shrieks of the grief-distracted mother, or would have drowned the noise of her drums and cymbals (ἀπὸ τοῦ κτύπου τῶν κυμβάλων καὶ τυμπάνων τοῦ γενομένου κατὰ ζήτησιν τῆς Κόρης, *schol.*). But such vagueness of reference is more in the style of Lykophron

¹ τοὺς ξυγγ. 'the (Scythian) relatives of,' cf. also *συγγα*, 704.

than of Aristophanes, and is especially unlikely in so forcible a passage. Hamaker conj. *Ἀποκλῆς παλαίων*. Blaydes remarks *mihī quidem mendosus videtur hic locus*. The true reading is, I think, suggested by the climax of the passage τοξότας, ὑπερετόξενυσεν, κ.τ.λ. The goddess who excelled at archery was of course Artemis, the goddess of the chase, ἑλαφάβόλος, θηροφόνη: and she could be jealous of mortal rivalry, witness the offence given by Agamemnon with his οὐδὲ ἡ Ἀρτεμις (Tzetzes *ad Lykophr.* 183). Now the huntress maiden had at Athens (*schol.* Ar. *equit.* 660) the title Ἀγγοτέρα, cf. Aristotle, *Aθ. πολ.* 58. Also she had, though it occurs less frequently, the epithet Ἀγραιά —cf. *schol.* Plato, *Phaedrus* 229 c Ἀγραιάς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν ἱδρυσαν οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι διὰ τὸ ἔφορον εἶναι παντὸς τοῦ ἀγρίου τὴν θεὰν καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἄγριον καὶ ἀνήμερον καταστέλλειν. Cf. Eustath. 361, 16. Similarly, Apollo had the title Ἀγραιός, Pausan. i. 41, 3. Aristophanes himself uses the name Ἀγγοτέρα in three of his plays, and in this passage I would read

οὐδ' ἂν αὐτὴν τὴν Ἀγραιάν ῥαδίως ἡνέσχετ' ἂν.

The error Ἀχαίαν was possibly helped by the expletive μὰ τὴν Δῆμητρα having occurred in the line preceding.

C. E. S. HEADLAM.

NOTES ON VERGIL AND TACITUS.

Cuncta equidem tibi, rex, fuerit quodcunque fatebor

Vera, inquit: neque me Argolica de gente negabo.

Hoc primum: nec, si miserum fortuna Sinonem

Finxit, vanum etiam mendacemque improba finget.

Verg. *Aen.* II 77-80.

In this passage all the commentators seem to me to have overlooked a point, though not unnaturally since it is one of Vergil's feeblor strokes. *Finxit* is interpreted as 'has made me to appear,' and the same sense is ascribed to *finget*. Evidently however the two words are not placed in their emphatic positions, made more emphatic by the antithesis, without good reason. Now the only reason which I can see for this is that the words have a double sense (1) the obvious sense, (2) a covert sense. 'If fortune has feigned (i.e. (1) 'made to appear' (2) 'made falsely to appear') Sino unfortunate, it shall not feign him (i.e. (1) 'make him to appear' (2) 'make him falsely to appear') a vain liar? Thus in the *finxit* Sino insolently mocks those whom he is deceiving, and in the *finget* the poet by an employment of the Tragic Irony makes him express his own condemnation. 'Not falsely shall fortune make him out a liar.'

That this is what Vergil intended is, I think, clear; it is an imitation of Greek Tragedy, but wanting in vigour and out of place in the Epic, as the oversight of all the commentators seems to prove.

Silvia prima soror, palmis percussa lacertos,
Auxilium vocat et duos conclamat agrestes.
Aen. VII. 503-4.

In the note on this passage Conington states that the only quoted parallel to the words in Italics is Claudian *Rapt. Proserp.* II 248-9 *planctuque lacertos verberat*. But Facciolati gives us three references to Ovid's *Metamor-*

phoses (s. *lacertus*) and one to Lucan: we may add Statius *Silv.* II 6. 82. In all these passages some form of *plango* or its derivatives occurs, and Sidgwick explains the action in our passage as a 'natural gesture of horror.' Plainly, however, the gesture is in the *Aeneid* a signal and not a mere expression of horror, as appears from l. 504. Vergil therefore understands the gesture in a different sense from his successors. Whether 'natural' or not, it may be of great antiquity, since under the name *asphotanam* it was a form of challenge used by wrestlers, etc. in ancient India.

Mox cessere hostes et sequentibus diebus crebra pro portis proelia cerebant.—Tac. *Hist.* V c. 11.

This phrase is usually explained as equivalent to *crebra proelia committebant*. But it is impossible to distinguish between the use of *sero* here and in

bella ex bellis serendo.—Sall. *Mithr.*

ex aeternitate causa causam serens.—Cic. *De Fat.* 12.

alternum seritote diem concorditer ambo —Ennius.

rerum humanarum ordo seritur. —Liv. xxv. 6.

Therefore the meaning is 'they engaged in a series of combats' sc. from day to day. It is true that from *consero* we have not only

nocti conseruisse diem—Ov. *Am.* III. 6. 10,

but also *conserere pugnam*. This, however, is merely an accusative of result, and the things which are really 'strung together' are *manus*. *Serere pugnam* would be an impossible expression: the plural is wanted.

This explanation, let me add, seems to be accepted by Forcellini, from whom the above examples are cited.

F. W. THOMAS.

THE OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI.

(Abstract of a paper read before the Oxford Philological Society on November 5, 1897, by Mr. A. S. HUNT, M.A.)

AFTER a few general remarks descriptive of the great find of papyri made by Mr. Grenfell and himself at Oxyrhynchus last winter, Mr. Hunt gave a sketch of that part of the collection, comprising about one-sixth of the whole, which has up to the present been examined. The literary section was first dealt with. Among the classical pieces not previously extant, the following were specified:—

(1) A Sapphic fragment, from a MS. of the third century, A.D. The five stanzas of which this is composed are rather mutilated, but the sense of the first three is clear, and satisfactory restoration is so far possible. The occasion of the ode is the departure of the brother of Sappho—for there seems to be no reason for doubt that she herself was the writer—upon a voyage.

(2) A hexameter fragment in the dialect of Alkman, and probably to be attributed to him. The papyrus contains three broken lines from the end of a poem, and four complete ones from the beginning of another.

(3) A prose fragment, five columns in length, being part of a treatise on metre, most probably the *ῥυθμικὰ στοιχεῖα* of Aristoxenus. The analysis of the different rhythms of which the fragment treats is illustrated by quotations from lyric poems, possibly the choruses of lost tragedies.

(4) A considerable fragment from a chronological treatise of doubtful authorship, giving a summary of the chief events during the years 356—316 B.C. Account is taken in this work not only of Greek, but of Oriental and Roman affairs, and events of literary interest also find a place. The contemporaneous discovery of a second piece of the Parian Chronicle, covering just the same period, lends this papyrus a peculiar interest.

Brief mention was also made of two comic fragments, a short elegiac fragment, and some mutilated *στίχοι μέλονται*, intended to be sung to the flute.

A long list was given of fragments from works already extant, special notice being taken of the following:—

(1) A leaf from a papyrus book of the third century, containing most of the first chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel. The few

peculiar variants preserved in this early fragment are for the most part confined to the spelling of Christian names.

(2) A small vellum leaf from a fourth century MS. of the apocryphal 'Acts of Paul and Thecla.' The fragment exhibits a remarkable number of variations from the mediaeval text, and affords a valuable clue to the extent of the changes produced by the editing processes which the book is supposed to have undergone.

(3) A first century Thucydides papyrus, recently published in the Archaeological Report for 1897 of the Egypt Exploration Fund. The importance of this discovery was shown to consist chiefly in the support given by it to the vulgate text, as against the attacks of some modern critics.

(4) A fragment of Sophocles's *Oedipus Tyrannus*, of the fifth century, which, if containing no remarkable variants, is not unimportant for purposes of textual criticism.

A connecting link between the literary and non-literary sections was found in a number of semi-literary documents—parts of collections of scholia, dictionaries of Homeric and other words, fragments of Greek accident, medical prescriptions, and the like. A selection of the most interesting non-literary documents was then passed in review, illustrating the variety of the collection and the valuable information which these original records afford upon the public and private life of Roman Egypt.

This survey of the materials led to some deductions upon the relation between the papyri and certain departments of research. It is to Egypt that the scholar now chiefly looks, both for fresh additions to the classical treasury and for new evidence upon existing texts. Much insight too may be gained from this quarter into the obscurer byways of literature, the traces of which have become indistinct or even completely obliterated. To the theologian the papyri offer similar encouragement, by holding out hopes of the recovery, on the one hand of texts which go behind those which have descended to us, on the other of some of those records of early Christianity, which have been partially or entirely lost.

For the internal history of Egypt under Ptolemaic and Roman rule the papyri are by far the most important source of information; and Greek and Roman law may here be studied in the concrete. Palaeography has no less a debt to acknowledge. The Oxyrhynchus collection in particular will throw considerable light upon the development of the Greek literary hand, and will fill up some gaps in the evidence for the

history of cursive writing. It also includes some remarkably early specimens of tachygraphy. These papyri are, moreover, rich in miscellaneous palaeographical data, e.g., for the history of abbreviations and contractions, the rise and growth of the use of accents, breathings and other lection signs, the forms of books, and other cognate subjects.

THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF LOGIA JESU II.

λέγει Ἰησοῦς, ἐὰν μὴ νηστεύσατε τὸ τοῦ κόσμου οὐ μὴ εἴρητε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ· καὶ ἐὰν μὴ σαββατίσσητε τὸ σάββατον οὐκ ὀφείθε τὸν πατέρα.

Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 15, 99 has οἱ μὲν εἰνονχίσαντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν μακάριοι οἱτοί· εἰσιν οἱ τοῦ κόσμου νηστεύοντες. The striking similarity of this last phrase with the above quoted logion seems to justify the correction of the acc. to the gen.

The whole passage in Clement, from which the extract is taken, may be read as a commentary upon the logion. The third book of the *Stromata* deals with heretical teachings about marriage, especially those which leaned towards asceticism. Among other writers Clement singles out Julius Cassianus, l.c. 91. Now Cassianus in the passage quoted by Clement makes special use of Isaiah 56, 3, μὴ λεγέτω ὁ εἰνοῦχος ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι ζῆλός. Clement devotes two paragraphs l.c. 98, 99 to the discussion of this same text, and it is in the latter that the striking parallel to the logion occurs.

In this discussion, Cassianus, l.c. 91, appeals to 'a saying of the Lord' (ἔφη ὁ κύριος). Clement objects, l.c. 92, that it is not found in any of the four Gospels but is found in the Gospel according to the Egyptians, and then proceeds to interpret the saying in an allegorical manner, l.c. 93. From this it may be inferred that Clement had access to the Gospel in question, if indeed it was not actually before him at the time of writing this book of the *Stromata*; cf. *Strom.* iii. 9, 63 ff.

Let us now turn to iii. 15, 98-9, remembering (a) that Clement has Cassianus in view, (b) that we are to be ready therefore for references to the Gospel of the Egyptians. Clement begins by quoting Isaiah 56 vv. 3-5 and comments upon the passage

thus: 'Neither the condition of a eunuch, nor his keeping of the sabbath justifies him, unless he do the commandments.' It is in the same spirit that Clement ends the passage l.c. 99, and gives the interpretation of the strange phrase 'fasting from the world.' 'Those who have made themselves eunuchs from all sin (i.e. spiritually) for the kingdom of heaven's sake—blessed are they for *they fast from the world.*'

I venture to suggest, therefore, that the Logia are fragments of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, or even fragments of an original collection of sayings upon which the Gospel was perhaps based. The extant portions of that Gospel are in the form of short sayings uttered in response to questions upon particular cases, and resemble very closely both in form and matter the recently discovered Logia; cf. Clem. *Strom.* iii. 6, 46; 9, 63 ff. (The first part of the fifth logion seems to be alluded to *Strom.* iii. 10, 68.)

If this is the case, the Logia are perhaps to be interpreted in the light of the Encratism amid which the Gospel according to the Egyptians was in vogue. (Salmon, *Introduction to N.T.* 4th Ed., p. 203.)

It is noteworthy however that Clement seems to attach an almost canonical authority to his quotations, cf. 64. Perhaps we may connect the Logia with the apocryphal Gospel, without closing altogether the question of their genuineness.

FRANK GRANGER.

NOTE.—Since I wrote the above, I find that Professors Harnack and Armitage Robinson have discussed the relation of the Logia to the Gospel according to the Egyptians, in the *Expositor* for December 1897. Harnack, however, does not refer to the above parallel, and Armitage Robinson draws somewhat different inferences.—F. G.

NOTE ON [DEM.] 42, 25.

[Dem.] 42, 25. καλὼν γὰρ ἀγαθὼν ἔστι δικαστῶν τοὺς μὲν τῶν πολιτῶν ἐθέλοντας, ὅταν εὐπωρῶσι, λητουργούντας καὶ ἐν τοῖς τριακοσίοις ὄντας ἀναπαύειν, ὅταν τούτου δέοντες τυγχάνωσι, τοὺς δὲ νομίζοντας ἀπολλύειν, ὅταν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τι δαπανήσωσιν, ἄγειν εἰς τοὺς προεισφέροντας καὶ μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν δραπετεύειν.

Baiter and Sauppe, Dindorf (1874), and Blass (1889) print in this passage ἐθέλοντας. The change of an accent restores clearness and order to the period. Read ἐθελοντάς, and compare Dem. 19, 230, καὶ ὁ μὲν χορηγῶν καὶ τριηραρχῶν ἔτι καὶ ταῦτ' ὥστε δεῖν ἐθελοντῆς ἀναλίσκειν, λύεσθαι, μηδὲν' ἐν συμφορᾷ τῶν πολιτῶν δι' ἔνδειαν περιορᾶν, 18, 68 τῆς ἑλευ-

θερίας αὐτεπαγγελοῦς ἐθελοντάς παραχωρήσαι Φιλίππῳ, *ib.* 99 τῶν ἐθελοντῶν τριηράρχων τότε πρῶτον γενομένων τῇ πόλει, ὧν εἰς ἣν ἐγώ, 21, 156 τραγωδοῖς κεχορηγήκε ποθ' οὗτος, ἐγὼ δ' αὐληταῖς ἀνδράσι. καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο τάνάλωμ' ἐκείνης τῆς δαπάνης πλέον ἔστι πολλῶ, οὐδεὶς ἀγνοεῖ δῆπου. καὶ μὲν ἐθελοντῆς νῦν, οὗτος δὲ καταστὰς ἐξ ἀντιδόσεως τότε, οὐ χάριν οὐδεμίαν δῆπον δικαίως ἂν τις ἔχοι, *ib.* 13 παρελθὼν ὑπεσχόμεν ἐγὼ χορηγήσειν ἐθελοντῆς, 4, 29 ἐγὼ συμπλέων ἐθελοντῆς πᾶσχειν ὅτιον ἔτοιμος, ἂν μὴ ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχη, 45, 85 πέντε τριῆρεις ἐθελοντῆς ἐπιδούς καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ πληρώσας ἐτριηράρχησε τριηραρχίας.

W. WYSE.

NOTES ON THE PHILOCTETES.

1. ἀλλ' ἀνέδην, ὁ δὲ χώρος ἄρ' οὐκ ἔτι, οὐκ ἔτι φοβητὸς ὑμῖν, ἔρπετε.

'Nay roam at large; the place hath no more terrors for you—no more.'

The translation is Professor Jebb's, and ἄρ' οὐκ ἔτι is his correction of ἐρύκεται.

But ἄρα is not the conjunction required, nor is it helped by reading ὁ δὲ for ὅδε. Why not read ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔτι? We have several instances of the synzesis in this play:

ἔμελλ'· ἐπεὶ οὐδὲν πω κακόνγ' ἀπώλετο. 446.

οὐ γὰρ ἂν σθένοντά γε εἰλέν μ'· ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἂν ὧδ' ἔχοντ' εἰ μὴ δόλω. 947.

ἔξοιδα δ' ὅς με μέλει γ'· ἐπεὶ οὐποτ' ἂν στόλον ἐπλεύσατ' ἂν τόνδ'. 1037.

Porson's correction of χωλὸς for χώρος seems clearly to deserve acceptance.

2. οὐ γάρ με τᾶλγος τῶν παρελθόντων δάκνει, ἀλλ' οἷα χρὴ παθεῖν με πρὸς τούτων ἔτι δοκῶ προλεύσσειν. οἷς γὰρ ἡ γνώμη κακῶν μῆτηρ γένηται, τᾶλλα παιδεύει κακά. 1358.

Philoctetes here gives us a screed of

juristic or ethical psychology: viz. He who has once committed a deliberate, premeditated crime is capable of any wickedness. Γνώμη, then, stands for the Aristotelian προαίρεσις, deliberate intention; which implies, when it violates law, ἀδικία, κακία, πονηρία, ἥθους—a readiness to break law on every occasion. This being the thought, τᾶλλα is evidently inadequate, and should be replaced by πάντα, as Meineke recommends. Professor Jebb reads κακοὺς; but κακὰ is perhaps preferable; for, according to the doctrine, the agents are already κακοὶ (depraved, wicked) without any further παίδεσις. Translate: 'It is not resentment for the past that stings me; but I seem to foresee what I am doomed to suffer from them in the future: for men whose deliberate intention has been author of a single wrong are prepared to perpetrate any crime.'

Here 'single' is implied by the aorist. The language (μῆτηρ, παιδεύει) is not felicitous, but no proposed emendation is satisfactory. Philoctetes, of course, is speaking perversely: for it is impossible to believe that fear rather than anger dictates his refusal to go to Troy; but Sophocles intends him to betray that long sufferings have warped his judgment—or his will.

E. POSTE.

THE WORD *χλωραίχην* IN SIMONIDES AND BACCHYLIDES.

SOME years ago I wrote a brief note in this *Review* (vol. iv. p. 231) in which I attempted to show that the words *χλωρηΐς*, *χλωραίχην* applied to the nightingale in the *Odyssey* and in Simonides, should be referred to sound, not to colour; that the force of *χλωρός* here is the same as in *χλοερὰ ῥέεθρα*, derived from the springing of the grass as being *fresh, living, gushing*, so that the nightingale is described as having a clear, liquid, or gushing note; that, in fact, the idea is the same as in the 'liquidæ voces avium' of Lucretius, or the 'full-throated' of Keats. I am confirmed in my opinion that, at any rate, it is not a word of colour by the use of *χλωραίχην* in Bacchylides, v. 172—Imagine Bacchylides, four lines further on, using *χλωρώλενε Καλλιόπα* as equivalent to *λεγκώλενε Καλλιόπα*!—Bacchylides applies to a girl, whom he wishes to compliment, the same epithet which his uncle applied to a nightingale. What have a girl's neck and a nightingale's in common? In this position of the case surely colour is put out of court. We must choose between two things, *form* and *sound*. Both bird and lady may be supple-necked, flexible-necked, or both may be clear-voiced, liquid-voiced. Here may be suggested a comparison with Hesiod, *Op.* 203, 'ἀηδόνα ποικιλόδευρον.' Paley says 'spotted-necked.' To this there is an objection which I must confess I regard as superior to all philological considerations. The nightingale has not a spotted neck. For I do not think anyone will maintain that the *ἀηδών* of the Greeks was the so-called 'thrush-nightingale.'¹ But there is no difficulty in taking the word to mean 'with quivering throat,' and in that epithet ideas, both of form and sound, are conveyed. Or it may = *ποικιλόγερυν*, 'of varied note.'

¹ The true nightingale, of course, is common in Greece.

In the latter case an objection may be raised to giving *δέρη* (or *αἶχην*) the meaning of *λάρυγξ*: but I think the passage in Aesch. *Ag.* 328, 'ἐξ ἐλευθέρον δέρης ἀποιμύζονσι' supports that meaning; and in a physical sense the word *αἶχην* unquestionably can do duty for both our words 'neck' and 'throat.' It can be applied equally to the back of the neck which bears the yoke, or to the throat of the victim, which is cut.

I confess I halt between two opinions, form or sound. In favour of my original view that it refers to sound, there is this consideration: that it is difficult to see how *χλωρηΐς* would get its sense as easily, if it referred to the flexible neck of the nightingale. In one case neck is omitted, in the other voice. Which would be most natural, 'flexible nightingale' or 'liquid nightingale?' I think it is easier to imagine the nightingale as all voice than as all neck—in fact, as an 'unbodied voice,' just as Shelley's lark was an 'unbodied joy.' The nightingale does not sing quite as much out of our sight as the lark does, but it is much more often heard than seen; the proportion, perhaps, is about the same as in the case of the cuckoo, who, to Wordsworth, was 'a wandering voice.' Hence it is not improbable that the nightingale might have an epithet which properly belongs to its note. On the other hand it may be adduced in favour of 'flexible-necked,' that it may not improperly in the passage of the *Odyssey* (xi. 518) convey the idea which is emphasized three lines further on by the words 'ἦ τε θαμὰ τραπέζῃ': and the *χλωρὸν γόνυ* of Theocr. xiv. 70 will probably support this rendering. Whichever of these two interpretations may be right, it is surely made quite clear by Bacchylides that the lexicons are wrong with their 'pale-green-necked.'

G. E. MARINDIN.

HAIGH'S TRAGIC DRAMA OF THE GREEKS.

The Tragic Drama of the Greeks. By A. E. HAIGH, M.A. With illustrations. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1896. Pp. 499. 12s. 6d.

MR. HAIGH is deservedly well known by his *Attic Theatre*. His present work is, there-

fore, one that the student of Greek tragedy will open with an interest due at once to the subject and to the author. But to some the first impression may be a certain sense of disappointment. In many respects the feeling is unjust. Mr. Haigh has sent out his book void of preface, but one would

fairly infer from the preface to the *Attic Theatre* that his purpose in this second treatise had been to collect and piece together all the available information concerning the origin, development and decay of the old Athenian tragic drama. It may further be inferred from the general style of the book itself that it is the result of Mr. Haigh's college lectures, and that its usefulness has been already tested. He has aimed to put sound material in the hands of students at large, not to write an 'epoch-making' book, and has supplied a comprehensive English manual of the subject. He has tried to say not new things, but always true ones. He has read much and intelligently; he writes clearly and sensibly; he is not carried away by new theories, because they are new; and he has covered the wide ground of his subject with tolerable evenness. But a book of this commanding form that contains little that is strikingly novel or new will, rightly or wrongly, disappoint scholars, glad though they may well be to recommend it to their students.

To enter somewhat more into detail, Mr. Haigh has divided his material into six chapters. In the first he treats briefly (too briefly one may well think, considering the size of the book) the early history of Greek tragedy. Then three several chapters are given to the lives and works of the three great tragedians. A fifth chapter deals with the form and character of Greek tragedy and a sixth with the later history of Greek tragedy down to its formal extinction. It may be said in passing that it would have been justifiable and doubtless productive of good, had the 'Great Three' been treated in another than the orthodox order, *i.e.* had Euripides been made to follow Aeschylus immediately, Sophocles being then discussed in his relations to the other two.

In the opening chapter the author's apparent absence of personal opinions and his lack of sureness in the handling of matters of mythology and archaeology hinder distinctness and coherence. A primitive indigenous nature-worship (phallus-worship, tree-worship) and an alien cult of Dionysus as coalescing forces are not made distinct enough. Nor is the tendency of a strongly marked and systematised cult to absorb kindred and even alien elements sufficiently emphasised. Again, the failure to distinguish periods of art and such vague reference as 'ancient paintings' vitiate the paragraph that deals with the Bacchantes and the minor followers of Dionysus (pp.

7-8). At p. 26 one misses in note 1 a reference to the late Professor Merriam's monograph on *Icaria* in the *Seventh Annual Report* of the American School at Athens. What is said of a 'formal prologue' in the Thespian tragedy (p. 31 *sq.*) is not satisfactory. Notwithstanding the impossibility of attaining absolute certainty in this matter (see p. 248, note 1), it is surely venturesome to claim a prologue in the Euripidean (or, rather, Aristophanic) sense for the early tragedy. The most that can be affirmed seems to be that the Aristotelian prologue (*i.e.* non-lyrical matter preceding the *parodos*) may be earlier than Aeschylus. It is hardly hypercritical to object to the statement (p. 35) that at the opening of Aeschylus's *Suppliants* 'the fifty [?] daughters of Danaus are seen crouching round an altar' (italics reviewer's) or to the implication (*ibid.*) that the opening anapaests of that play are sung by the whole chorus.

But Mr. Haigh improves as he advances in his subject. The account of Aeschylus is good—clear, sober and sensible. But one dislikes to see at this late day the famous tale of the *ἱκρία* and the stone theatre told as it is at p. 48. The fact that the Athenians were, in the growth of their empire, *δύσπερες τῶν ἀπόντων* is perhaps a sufficient explanation of Aeschylus's geographical digressions (p. 76). The terms trilogy and tetralogy are assumed (p. 96) to go back to the fifth century, though there seems to be no direct proof that they are *prae-Alexandrian*. At p. 100 we miss in the account of the preservation of the plays a reference to v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: indeed the references throughout the book often surprise one by their omissions. But of this more later. It must further be said that the question of the date of the *Prometheus* is not treated fully enough and that something should be said about the possible post-Aeschylean revision of the play.

Notwithstanding Mr. Haigh's apparent wish to treat Sophocles with orthodox admiration, his frank study of the poet makes him say some things that will give heretics a wicked pleasure; but the treatment is uneven. At p. 156 we are told that 'though the connexion [of Sophocles's choruses with the subject matter of the drama] varies in point of closeness, it is always obvious and intelligible.' It did not need M. Decharme's trenchant words (*Euripide et l'esprit de son théâtre*, p. 456) to emphasise the looseness of attachment of *Antig.* 334-375—a passage that would have been treated as a flagrant *εμβόλιμον* had its

author been Euripides. But at p. 188 Sophocles is charged with padding the *Ajax*, and the harshness of style of the *Antigone* is not overlooked at p. 162. The treatment of Sophocles's style at pp. 163-165 is excellent, but one would like to see its Thucydidean quality brought more into relief. To mention some matters of detail, at p. 136 (note 2) Sophocles is said to have copied Herodotus in *Ant.* 905-911, but the famous question about this passage is first referred to at p. 185, where it is handled with justice (I think) though perhaps too briefly. At p. 140 (or in chap. V.) something might perhaps have been said about the question of the regulation of the length of Attic plays. At p. 162 the opening of the *Antigone* is cited in illustration of Sophocles's fondness for involved expression! This is but one of the instances, not a few, that might be cited of Mr. Haigh's uncritical attitude towards his texts (not to mention such things as his retention of the forms *σάξω* and *οἰκτεῖρω*). The question of the dating of Sophocles's plays is not well handled. A combination of the data furnished by the hypotheses of the *Antigone* and *Alceste* (in the latter *ι* for *ξ* seems certain) may be interpreted as showing that the numbers refer not to lists 'drawn up for the convenience of students and purchasers' (p. 402), but to records (didascalic?) in which the year of the poet's dramatic career was indicated. The date 437 B.C. for the *Antigone* would hang well enough together with the story of the generalship, especially as the *Γένος* says that Sophocles was made general seven years before the Peloponnesian war. Of course, this is assuming that the traditions of the generalship and of the date of the play are confused in our 'sources.' Again the references to the Plague and the reminiscences of the *Hippolytus* in the *Oedipus Rex* (cf. 965 sq. with *Hipp.* 1058 sq.; 584 sqq. with *Hipp.* 1012-1020; 1325 sq. with *Hipp.* 86 [and perhaps 1091 sqq.]; possibly too 481 sq. should be compared with *Hipp.* 564), taken together with other indications (see Bethe, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Theaters in Alterthum*, p. 194, note 15), seem to fix 427 B.C. as the *terminus post quem* of Sophocles's play. The date of the *Electra* is not discussed. Before leaving Sophocles Mr. Haigh's just appreciation of that beautiful play, the *Trachiniae* (p. 188) must be warmly commended.

The long treatment of Euripides (pp. 304-321), in a manner the *pièce de résistance* of the book, is in the main just and

good, but demands correction and criticism in details. The works of M. Decharme (whose *Euripide et l'esprit de son théâtre* is incorrectly named at p. 207, but rightly at pp. 262 and 271) and of Professor v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (particularly his *Herakles*, which is cited at p. 299 without indication of volume or edition) would justly, it seems to the reviewer, have been more freely referred to. The latter's *Herakles*, as well as his *Analecta Euripidea*, should have been cited at p. 281 (note 1), and his reasonably certain dating of the *Heracidae* (in independent agreement with Haupt: see *Analect. Eur.* p. 152) between 429 and 427 should at least have been mentioned. M. Decharme's treatment of the Euripidean prologue and epilogue should have been mentioned in connection with what is said pp. 247-251, and his treatment of the chorus in Euripides, which is fairer, though less moderate, than Mr. Haigh's, should have been alluded to.

One may be justified in thinking that Euripides's relation to Sophocles is hardly well stated at p. 218. His 'priesthood' too (if 'priest' be the proper rendering of *πυρφόρος* as used in the *Γένος*) is not necessarily to be regarded as it is at p. 268 (note 2). (See Wilamowitz, *Herakl.* p. 5, note 8. Had a youthful temple-service any influence on Euripides's charming picture of Ion at Delphi?)

At p. 279 the fact that *Med.* 246 has been rejected by Wilamowitz and after him by Weil and v. Arnim (though M. Weil in his note on v. 266 inconsistently accepts a scheme of division of vv. 214-265 that would prove v. 246 genuine) might have been alluded to, if only to defend the tradition. It may be doubted in passing whether Mr. Haigh has quite done justice to Euripides's treatment of women. But it is not easy to do it. At p. 283 (note 4 to p. 282) the *Bacchae* and *Iph. Aul.* are dated 'soon after 406.' Did Euripides write in the other world? This brings us to the dating of Euripides's plays in general, a matter of which Mr. Haigh might have given a fuller treatment.

At p. 283 the methods of ascertaining the date of plays of which the date is not preserved in an *ἐπιόκειν* are not quite well stated. Nothing is said of allusions to historical events in the plays themselves or of references in Aristophanes and the scholia, although both these methods are employed in the sequel. The question of the authenticity of the *Rhesus* is unsatisfactorily handled. The more recent literature

of the subject including Professor Rolfe's article in *Harvard Studies* vol. iv. pp. 61 *sqq.*, might well have been referred to. The date assigned to the *Heracleidae* (430 or 429) ignores Wilamowitz (see above), nor is his discussion of the date of the *Hercules* alluded to. For the date assigned to the *Electra* M. Weil's notices in the *Sept Tragédies* should have been cited. Though the *Iph. Taur.* is placed after the *Helen*, the question of the probability (or improbability) of its posteriority is not discussed. The *Ion* is inserted between the *Helen* and the *Iph. Taur.* with its date given as 'very uncertain.'

It may be remarked that the treatment of the *Alcestis* can hardly be pronounced satisfying. The *Troades* too gets scant justice. The famous picture of the sack of the city in the *Hecuba* (p. 295) might well be called not merely 'one of the most beautiful lyrics in Euripides' but one of the most beautiful in all literature. It may be noted that Evadne's allusion to her future renown (p. 296, note 1), if indeed it be such, need be no more than a reference to the play itself (like that in *Alc.* 452, where see Weil's note).

The chapter on the form and character of Greek Tragedy is divided into sections dealing with general characteristics, the subjects, the characters (at the close of this section the famous 'pity and terror' is briefly discussed without, however, entering into the question of the objectivity or subjectivity of the 'terror'), unity of structure (what is said of the romantic drama at p. 338 is good: it might have been added that the first part of the story of *Othello* would have found place in a Euripidean prologue, like that of the *Hippolytus*), treatment of the plot, formal divisions, language, versification, symmetry of form, the satyric drama, and the titles of Greek tragedies. It may be noted that *πρόλογος* did not 'originally' (p. 351) denote the whole of the opening scene (that sense is Aristotelian) and that *ἐπεισόδιον* (sc. *μέρος*) is derived directly from *ἐπίστροφος*, 'subsequent entrance' (p. 353). The opening anapaests were more probably recited by the coryphaeus than by the chorus (p. 355). The term *στάσιμον* is rightly to be explained as an adjective derived directly from *στάσις* (see Professor Jebb's *Oed. Tyr.*² p. 8). In the section on language one ought to be referred to Professor Smyth's *Ionian Dialect*. To mention the Epic language as old Ionic (p. 366) is to tread on dangerous ground.

With versification Mr. Haigh does not deal as fully as he might have done; how-

ever, this is a case in which discretion is the better part of valour. Still in discussing iambs he might have gone a little further. The fact should be noted that it is Sophocles that elides at the end of a trimeter and otherwise shows a tendency to treat that verse as a colon, thus working with larger unities in the dialogue. The use of anapaests by the coryphaeus at the close of a choral song seems susceptible of a better explanation than that given at p. 375.

A very interesting part of chapter V. is that which has to do with symmetry of form. It is well that this important subject should be brought prominently to the notice of students. It has been too little regarded. It is meet too that it be treated with some wise reserve. But Mr. Haigh keeps too far to windward. It ought to be plainly said (and here again Mr. Haigh's uncritical attitude towards the text is very evident) that the bad preservation of the Tragedians is to blame for the fact that structural (and verbal) responsions are not more evident. One is surprised to find (p. 382) the speeches of Medea and Jason in *Med.* 465-575 declared to be of fifty-four and fifty-five lines respectively. But v. 468 is generally and justly condemned; so the speeches are of precisely equal length. Again the speeches of Creon and Haemon in *Ant.* 639 *sqq.* (cited p. 382, note 2) may fairly be regarded as of equal length. The simplest cure for the difficulty in vv. 690-1 is to assume, with van Herwerden, a lacuna of a verse after 690, to be supplied perhaps <τὸ μὴ τιν' ἀστὼν ἐμφανὸς χρῆσθαι ποτε>. So again in the *Septem* it seems against all reasonable probability that we have in vv. 375-676 only partial symmetry: there are abundant indications that the text is mutilated. More than that there is some verbal balancing. Thus (the most striking case) in vv. 421-451 (15 = 15) the words *μνησθῆναι θάλασσαν* in 431 are answered by the same words in 446. But this is not the place to carry this discussion further. It may merely be added that the choral antistrophic responsions referred to at p. 339 are not confined to phrases, but extend to words and syllables, and might well have been more fully treated and illustrated.

The final chapter on the later history of Greek tragedy, where Mr. Haigh's knowledge of inscriptional evidence comes into play, seems to call for no detailed discussion. It may be observed in passing that the doubt about the spelling of Meletus's name (p. 417) would seem to be settled by the puns in Plato's *Apology* (24 D and 25 C).

The book concludes with two useful appendixes, one of tragic poets with a brief account of each, supplemental to the account of minor poets in chap. VI.; the other, of titles of Greek tragedies and Satyric dramas classified according to mythic cycle and subject.

The process plates representing the

Tragedians (including, of course, the famous Lateran Sophocles) and the youthful Dionysus (facing p. 12) add to the attractive appearance of the book.

The mistakes in the printing and accenting of Greek are commendably few.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

GARDNER AND JEVONS' GREEK ANTIQUITIES.

A Manual of Greek Antiquities, Books. I—V by PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., Books VI—IX by F. B. JEVONS, Litt.D. London, Charles Griffin & Co., pp. 736, 1895. 16s.

The present work aims at supplying the student with an introduction to the social, religious and political antiquities of Greece. Within the compass of a single volume of more than 700 pages the authors traverse the ground covered in the well-known Handbooks of Schömann, K. F. Hermann and Iwan von Müller. Professor Percy Gardner is responsible for the first four hundred pages, including Chapters on the 'Land and People,' on the house in Homeric and historic times, on Religion and Mythology, on Temples and Religious Societies, on Sacrifice and Oracles, on the Public Games and the Mysteries. These amongst other topics occupy the first three Books. The fourth is on the 'Course of Life,' and touches on Education and Travel, on the position of women, on the treatment of disease, and on burial and tombs. The fifth is on Commerce, including agriculture and pasturage, manufactures and professions, trade-routes, and the money-market and coins. Dr. Jevons is responsible for the remaining four books, on Constitutional and Legal Antiquities, on Slavery, on War, and on the Theatre.

The object of the authors is 'to present to the English reader the elements of these subjects in a readable form.' The result of a careful perusal of the seven hundred pages of their work, which has occupied all the leisure hours of a single week, is a cordial appreciation of the success which has on the whole attended the execution of their laborious task. Professor Gardner's work is marked throughout by a mastery of the archaeological and the literary evidence bearing on religion and mythology and also

on the antiquities of ordinary life; while Dr. Jevons is no less thorough in his treatment of constitutional and legal antiquities and the other important topics that have fallen to his share. Perhaps the most satisfactory parts of the work are those in which Professor Gardner summarises the results of his own papers elsewhere, e.g. the chapters on the Homeric house, and the Olympian festival, on the mysteries of Eleusis and on the Asclepian shrine at Epidaurus. The chapter on sacrifice (inspired in part by Robertson Smith) and that on the classification of myths are also of special interest and importance, although the interpretation of the meteorological group of myths may be open to exception. Thus Hera is to some extent a 'moon-goddess' (126), yet she persecutes Io who also 'seems obviously the horned moon wandering through heaven under the countless eyes of the stars, which the breath of morning makes pale and closes.' The mythological counterpart of this is the story that Io 'is watched by the hundred eyes of Argus until that guardian is slain by Hermes' (90). Hermes is here identified as a wind-god, but it may be doubted whether the closest observation of the stars at dawn has ever detected any obscuration due to the influence of the wind.

Dr. Jevons has done good service in writing a consecutive account of Attic law which ought to be of special use to students of the Private Orations of Demosthenes; he has also given us a very satisfactory chapter on a more novel subject, the Law of Gortyna, and he has supplied us with a fairly adequate discussion of the views of Dr. Dörpfeld on the Greek Theatre.

Among the slight defects of the work may be mentioned a certain amount of repetition due in part to the way in which the subjects overlap one another. Thus, the manumission of slaves is treated not

only by Dr. Jevons under the head of 'Emancipation of Slaves' (p. 623), but also by Professor Gardner (p. 195), and the same illustrations from the Delphic inscriptions are noticed by both. In another edition some of these redundancies may be readily removed. Certain minor inaccuracies, which must here be noticed, will, it is hoped, be corrected at the earliest possible opportunity.

On p. 5 we are told that Plato 'compares the bare hills of Greece to the limbs wasted by disease of a once robust body:' whereas the passage quoted from the *Critias* does not refer to Greece in general but to the primitive state of the land that was afterwards known as Attica. On the same page *Boreas* is the N.E. wind, *Zephyrus* is N.W., and *Notus* the S.W.: but, although *Boreas* is sometimes described as the N.N.E. wind, there seems no sufficient reason for departing from the usual identification of these winds as N., W. and S. respectively. The influence of the climate of Attica and Boeotia on the intellectual character of their inhabitants is imperfectly illustrated by Pindar's *Βοιωτία ἴσ' : it would be better to refer to Cicero, de Fato iv 7, Athenis tenue caelum, ex quo etiam acutiores putantur Attici; crassum Thebis, itaque pingues Thebani et valentes*. Pausanias is described on p. 15 as 'the traveller,' but he has already been mentioned on the previous page without any such description. Beginners, for whom such a description may be necessary, will perhaps find it hard to understand what is meant on p. 13 by saying that the marketplace at Athens was frequented by 'the masters of the Socratic elenchus'; nor will they expect to be told in the text (instead of in the note) that 'Rumpf is wrong in supposing that there was anything special or technical in the application of the term' *μυχός* (p. 26). When they read (on p. 14) that 'Athens had other smaller markets besides that of the Ceramicus, for instance, a corn-market, *στοὰ ἀφειρόπωλις*, built by Pericles,' and that 'in addition Piræus had two markets, one close to the sea and one further inland,' they will infer that the corn-market in question was in Athens, but they may eventually discover that it was in Piræus, as we are expressly told by the Scholiast on Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 548.¹

¹ It is, of course, very probable that there was also a *στοὰ ἀφειρόπωλις* in Athens itself (Curtius, *Athen*, p. xc), but it was the one in the *Peiræus* which was ascribed to Pericles (*ib.* p. cxvii), though Curtius himself (p. 173) happens to say the same of that in Athens. See, however, Curt Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen*, II i 96, 101.

The reference (for *πλήνους τοίχους*) to Plut. *Dem.* ii (on p. 18) is meant for II § 6. On the next page we are told that Hipparchus 'engraved moral saws' on the *Hermæ* 'in all parts of the city'; but the passage in Plato's *Hipparchus*, p. 228, only mentions inscriptions on *Hermæ* in the country. On p. 32 we are told that Demosthenes is 'speaking of the heroes of the days of Marathon' when he says that 'they erected such buildings and set up such works of art as posterity has never been able to surpass'; this would seem to imply that the Parthenon, &c., belong to 490 B.C., but a glance at the context of *Olynth.* 2 § 25 will show that the orator is referring to the age of Pericles no less than to the 'days of Marathon.'

Pausanias 'of Ceramicus' (p. 38) is an awkward rendering of *ὁ ἐκ Κεραμίδων*, i.e. 'of Ceramicus.' The *Oeconomicus* of Xenophon is on pp. 45, 350 exceptionally called the *Economics*. On p. 65 the authority for the long hair of Gylippus rousing the ridicule of the Syracusans is not Thuc. i 6, but Plut. *Nic.* 19. The former refers to the Athenian *κρωβύλος*, on which mention may now be made of Studniczka's elaborate excursus to the new edition of Classen's *Thucydides*. One might have welcomed a precise reference on p. 101 to the interpolated passage in Hesiod in honour of Heate, and on p. 149 to 'one of the few poetical lines' in the *Theogony*. On p. 131 *Aboniteichos* is used as an equivalent to *Ἀβώνον τείχος*. On p. 143 we are told that 'Lemnos contains an extinct volcano Mosychlus,' but it is known that not a trace of this volcano has been found by travellers, and the most plausible theory respecting it is that it is submerged among the shoals N.E. of the island (see Jebb's *Philoctetes*, p. 244). On p. 165, after Xenophon's *Mem.* iii 8 § 10 has been quoted as 'declaring such spots to be most fitted for dedication to the gods as could be well seen by all'..., we read 'Aristotle speaks to the same effect.' One might have expected a reference to *Pol.* viii 12 § 1. On p. 221 we find that the keenest shafts of polished wit are directed against outlandish cults by *Aristion*, Menander and Theophrastus. Is this a misprint for Aristophanes? On p. 232 the reference to ordeals by fire in the *Antigone* (*πῆρ δέειπεν*) might have been supplemented from the *Canon* of Demosthenes (54 § 40). For the varied applications of the word *ὄρνις* in the sense of 'omen' one would have preferred a precise reference to the *Aves*, l. 719, and similarly for the *πελειάδες* of Dodona, to *Trach.* 171. The chapter on 'Divination and Oracles' is

immediately followed (on p. 269) by one on the Public Games, ushered in by the words:—'To our account of Greek gymnastics, we add here a brief account of the Public Games'; but gymnastics is not treated until a later part of the volume, so that the chapter on the Public Games must originally have been meant to follow p. 322. On pp. 270–274 and p. 379, students who are not in the habit of thinking in *Olympiads* would have been glad to see the dates B.C. added in the margin. The position of Andania is undefined on p. 275, but ten pages later it is described as 'in Messenia'; similarly 'Arrhephoric maidens' are mentioned on p. 288 to be explained seven pages afterwards. 'Election by lot' (pp. 304, 484) is surely an inaccurate way of expressing appointment by that method. The fact that the *παιδονόμος* at Teos had to be 'not less than 40 years old' (p. 311) may be paralleled by the rule at Athens which required *τὸν παῖσιν χορηγοῦντα* to have attained that age (*Ἀθ. πολ.* 56). A reference to the treatise just quoted (42 § 3) should have been added to the account of the training of the Athenian *ἐφηβοί* (p. 312), and also (43 § 1) to the notice of the *κρητὼν ἐπιμεληταί* (p. 372). Of butter we are told on p. 328 that 'the Thracians seem to have employed it more especially for rubbing themselves with,' although the ordinary use of butter was so familiar to the Thracians that they are described by Anaxandrides as *ἄνδρες βουτροφάγοι*. On the same page *ἀκτάζειν* is so rare a term for a seaside picnic that one might have expected a reference to *Plut. Symp.* = *Q.* iv 4. The reference to Plato p. 212 on p. 335 requires the addition of the name of the dialogue, the *Symposium*. For the instance in 'Demosthenes' of a 'dowerless wife' who was 'acknowledged to be legally married' (p. 344), we should refer to p. 1015 (40 § 24) rather than to p. 1016. As the name of one of the early tribes of Attica, the form *Ἐργαδεῖς* (p. 380) has far less authority than *Ἀργαδεῖς*. In the English style there is little to criticise, though one does not like the split infinitives 'to constantly issue' (392), and 'to annually estimate' (505), or 'spectators in carefully arranged clothes' (317), or 'the cultivation of the bee' (376), or 'fashion' occurring twice in the same short sentence (95), or the odd effect produced by the description of Aegina in the following sentence:—'(the Acropolis) was above the level of the city, and looked over it to Aegina, the eyesore of the Piræus, and Salamis and Acrocorinthus' (p. 357). In contrast to these occasional

infelicities of phrase it is only fair to quote Dr. Gardner's fine characterisation of Athena

'As the pure and high-minded virgin, who shared the counsels of Zeus and imparted of her abundant wisdom to men; the lofty patroness who founded the Athenian state and still upheld it in a thousand dangers, giving its statesmen wisdom, and diffusing through the breasts of its soldiers valour, such as in days long gone by she had bestowed on Herakles and Tydens and Odysseus; receiving from the hands of the Athenian people all that they had best to bestow of art and poetry, and in return blessing the givers of these gifts with tenfold increase so that their city shone throughout Hellas as the queen of wisdom and the mistress of beauty' (p. 141).

Dr. Jevons contributes to the joint work more than 300 pages, mainly on Constitutional History and Law. This part of the work is, on the whole, excellent. Only a few small points admit of improvement in future editions. Thus, in connexion with Sparta we are told that the military office 'was for ever limited to the strict duty of the original war-king or *heretoga*' (419): we have to wait until the next chapter before this official is more precisely defined as the 'Teutonic *heretoga*' (438). Under Athens, it may be noticed that Aristotle's *ἐκτμήβοι* has better authority than Plutarch's *ἐκτμήβοι* (444). In the time of Solon, we are informed that 'for the archontate, each tribe elected the four men it thought best; and from the forty thus elected, the nine archons were chosen [or rather 'appointed'] by lot' (447); whereas we are expressly told that each tribe nominated ten (*Ἀθ. πολ.* 8 § 1), the number of tribes being four, as Dr. Jevons is well aware, for on a subsequent page he marks the transition from the 'four old tribes' to 'the ten new tribes' under Clisthenes (p. 450). The date at which the Areopagus was deprived of its political power by Ephialtes is stated (on p. 452) as B.C. 464, although the *Ἀθηναίων πολιτεία* (25 § 2, followed by Busolt) gives B.C. 462. *ἰσοτέλεια* is described as 'total exemption' from the *λειτουργίαι* as well as from the *μετοίκιον* (p. 455); here it ought to be made clear that by the *λειτουργίαι* are meant those that fell on the *μέτοικοι* alone. The Athenian is said (as in Gilbert i 218²) to have come of age 'on the completion of his seventeenth year' (458, 635), although we are distinctly told in *Ἀθ. πολ.* 42 § 1 that it was on the completion of the eighteenth (*ὀκτωκαίδεκα ἔτη γεγονότες*). The procedure in appointment by lot is somewhat awkwardly expressed on p. 464: 'the mode of election was that in the fifth century the demes, in the fourth century the

tribes, each nominated a certain number of candidates from whom the requisite officials were *chosen by lot*; the demes, however, proved corruptible, and their power of nomination was transferred to the tribes.' In the note on *δοκιμασία* (465), it might have been well to refer to 'Αθ. πολ. 55 §§ 2, 3. The distribution of the duties of the *στρατηγοί* began at an earlier date than 'between B.C. 334 and 325' (as stated on p. 473, and in my note on 'Αθ. πολ. 61 § 1); an inscription as early as B.C. 352 mentions τὸν στρατηγὸν τὸν ἐπὶ τὴν φυλακὴν τῆς χώρας κεχειροτονημένον (Foucart in *Bull. Corr. Hell.* xiv 434, 443). The singular number ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ θεωρικόν (474) must now be altered into the plural (see 'Αθ. πολ. 43 § 1, 47 § 2). Perrot, p. 255, appears on p. 477, without the title of the work referred to: it is not every student that is familiar with the *Essai sur le Droit Public d'Athènes*. Harpocration's quotation (p. 465) is now superseded by the actual text of the 'Αθ. πολ. 58 § 3. The reference for the polemarch's possible retention of jurisdiction in certain military offences (p. 480) should be *Lys. c. Alcib.* § 3 (not § 4); the other reference for this (D. 169), I do not understand. The tribunal of the polemarch was not 'in the *Lyceum*' (479) but at the 'Ἐπὶ Λύκειον' ('Αθ. πολ. 3 § 5), and that of the *Thesmothetae* was not the *Thesmosion* (480) but the *Θεσμοθετεῖον* ('Αθ. πολ. l.c.). Certain private cases came not 'before the Fourteen' (482), but before the Forty. For the jurisdiction of the polemarch in *δίκαι ἀπὸ συμβόλων* it is unnecessary to refer to any inscription (482); it is enough to quote 'Αθ. πολ. 58. Similarly, instead of relying on Caillemet's article on *Archontes* for information on the jurisdiction of the *Thesmothetae* (481), an article written while our information was still necessarily imperfect, it would have been better to follow c. 58 of the 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία. *Paredri* is misprinted for *proedri* (486). On the *Ecclesia* (492) a precise reference to 'Αθ. πολ. 43 § 4 should be added. On p. 498 *on* is omitted between 'any proposal' and 'the subject.' 'Any man who had to resort to legislation' (529) is a misprint for *litigation*. The case of death ensuing 'from an act which no one could foresee would have such a result' is illustrated by an example somewhat far removed from the province of Attic law, or even of real life, viz. 'the act of a merchant who cast away a date-stone, thereby causing the death of the genie's invisible son' (530). ἐπὶ τοῖς σώμασι μηδὲνα δανείζειν should now be quoted on the authority of 'Αθ. πολ. 6

and 9 rather than on that of Plutarch's *Solon* (539).

On p. 580 we read 'it was only the new dicasts who had to be distributed by lot among the *dicasteria*': the last word here seems to be used not of the 'law-courts,' but of the 'dicastic sections.' On p. 595 we are told that the manner in which 'the dicasts recorded their vote [in deciding between alternative penalties] in the fourth century is unknown': but it may be learnt from 'Αθ. πολ. col. 37, *ἔπειτα πάλιν τιμῶσι, ἀν δὲ τιμῆσαι, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ψήφίζομενοι*. Olynthus was captured by Philip not in 353 (p. 612) but in 348: this mistake is to be traced to Büchschütz, *Besitz u. Erwerb*, p. 112. *νεώριον* is surely a 'dock-yard' rather than a 'harbour' (658). On p. 676 one would have welcomed a reference to the authority for the use of *ἀπὸ Δήμνων* in the sense 'off Lemnos'.¹ On pp. 683, 686 A. Müller ought to be named, just as on p. 688. On p. 687 the index figures referring to two of the notes have gone wrong. On pp. 690-3 the term *ἐκκύκλημα* is repeated far too often, being printed no less than 24 times in Greek characters, and twice in English. 'It is only by a violent emendation and an improbable conjecture,' that the costume of tragedy can be connected with that of the Hierophants and Daduchi at Eleusis (698): but we have no reference to the passage meant, viz. *Athen.* p. 21 E. Texts on *Thespis* and on the 'choruses of men' are cited on p. 705 without any reference to their source, the Parian Marble. On pp. 706 and 708 it would have been well to refer to the copy of the inscription of B.C. 419-8 quoted in Haigh's *Attic Theatre*, p. 324. It is in connexion with the public performance of tragedies and comedies that we are told on p. 710 that 'where a modern audience cries *encore*, the Greek cried *aûdis*,' but the only authority for this, *Xen. Com.* (i.e. *Conv.*) 9, 4, refers to a private performance of a pantomime; and it might have been more to the purpose to quote *Cic. Tusc.* iv 63 *cum Orestem fabulam doceret Euripides, primos tres versus revocasse dicitur Socrates*.

The following words are wrongly accentuated on the pages referred to: *γυναικία* ἀγορά (13), *θεός* (41), *κλῖναι* (46), *λέβητες* (48), *χιτών* (53, 57, 58, 59), *χλαμύς* (56), *βλαῦται*, *κόθορνοι* and *Ἀχαιοί* (64), *τέττιξ* and *τέττιγες* (65), *κνοφόντις* (93), *εἶδος* (110), *ἀπαρχαί* (181), *μέλισσαι* (207), *ἀγνός* (216),

¹ 'Off' is expressed by *ὅπῃ* in *Thuc.* i 112 § 4 (*ὅπῃ Σαλαμῖνος*), 137 § 2; viii 95 § 5. This sense is not noticed in Liddell and Scott.

στεφανῖται (269), ὀπλιτῶν (273), κῆρυξ (276), γραμματιστής (308), κοσμητής (312), κλῖναι (329), ἑταῖροι (339, 352), συγγραφή (339), μου (345), δέσποναι (353), ὑδρία (368), αὐτοπῶλαι and ἔμποροι (391), τραπέζιται (395), ἀγέλαι (436), βασίλισσα (478), σιτῶναι (483), ἕξεισι (529), συνθηκῶν (540), and ἀποκηρύξαι (557). γυναικωνίτις is misspelt (37), ὠτάφαμι is a misprint for ἀφαμιώται (433), Κυθηροδίκης (615), and Πατροκλείδης (710) appear without the capital letter. 'According to *Ephesus*' (438) is meant for *Ephorus*, *Pegasæ* (613) for *Pagasaë*, *deities* for *deities* (244); *Bosphorus* (388, 393, 510), is preferred to the more accurate form *Bosporus*. ξένιας (482), φυλοβασιλείς (530), ἰδιώτην (534) δῶρον or δωροδοκίας (560), and διατητής (586) are misprinted, and διουσημία appears as διουσημία (596). On pp. 555-6, the abbreviation for *Isaeus* is misprinted in all the four references to that orator. It is fair to add that in the *Index*, which is the work of Miss E. M. Platt, the accents are almost invariably correct, the only exception noticed being ἄγνος for ἄγνός. κοσμητής (312) should be added to the *Index*, and further references for ἀγορά (12n and 460), and δοτρακιριμός 451.

There are nearly 40 cuts, most of them satisfactory. The plan of the *Greek House at Delos* (40) is specially welcome as a substitute for the 'supposed house at Delos which figures in Guhl and Kouer and other works.' 'Men Bathing' (315), is badly printed. The cut on p. 31 should be referred to on p. 29, 'the frieze of alabaster and glass.' The 'Greek Window' on p. 44 belongs to the previous page. The cuts are purposely limited in number, and for further illustrations the student is referred to Prof. Anderson's edition of Schreiber's *Atlas of Classical Antiquities*, as a work which may advantageously be used as a companion to the present volume.

Probably many of the above inaccuracies might have been removed if the authors had resorted to the simple expedient of, each of them, reading the proof sheets of his colleague. Such inaccuracies do not, however, detract seriously from the substantial merit of the work which, as a whole, deserves a hearty recognition on the part of scholars and a widely extended use among students of Greek Antiquities.

J. E. SANDYS.

BARNARD'S EDITION OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Quis Dives Salvetur*, edited by P. M. BARNARD (Texts and Studies v. 2). Cambridge Press, 1897. 3s.

THIS edition of Clement's most popular work does great credit both to the editor, and to the series of which it forms a part. The text is a vast improvement on that of all preceding editions, being based upon an Escorial MS. of the eleventh century (named by the editor S), from which was derived, what was till now held to be the ultimate authority for the text, viz., the Vatican MS. (V) of the sixteenth century. Even this latter seems to have been never examined since 1623, when Ghisler printed a very inaccurate transcript in his Commentary on Jeremiah, which has been the source of all subsequent texts. In the Introduction we read how Dr. Stählin, who has for some time been engaged on the much needed work of preparing a complete edition of the text of Clement, communicated to Mr. Barnard the fact that the catalogue of the Escorial MSS. made mention of a

homily commencing with the introductory words of the *Q.D.S.*, and how it was agreed between them that the collation of this MS. should be left to the latter. Both scholars had already collated the Vatican MS., and when the collation of S was made in August 1894, it speedily appeared that V was dependent upon it, as the words and letters which remained in a torn page of S were carefully copied in V, blank spaces being left for what had been torn away. The new collations not only enable us to correct many words which were wrongly given by Ghisler, but also to supply whole lines omitted by him. Of the former we may take the following examples.

§ 3 (D. p. 382, 20) εἰρ' ὑπὸ ταυμάτων : on which the note is 'V has εἰρ' ὑπὸταν μάθων quite clearly, but Ghisler's copyist seems to have been thrown out by the first ο of ὑπὸταν not being closed at the top and by the use of an ordinary ligature for ταυ. Segaar conjecturally restored the right reading, but subsequent editors were unable to see the excellence of his conjecture, which is not mentioned in Dindorf's critical note.'

§ 10 (D. p. 389, 5) ἐν τούτῳ παρῆναι τοῖς δλοῖς οὐ δεδόνηται: note 'V has παρῆναι, for this Ghisler printed παρῆναι...Stählin suggested προσθεῖναι which proves to be the reading of S.'

§ 12 (D. 390, 25) τὴν διάθεσιν γυμνῶσαι τῶν ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν: so Ghisler with V, Segaar conjectured ὑπόντων, which is found in S.

§ 28 (D. 406, 3). Here Ghisler read with V οἶον ἔλαιον, Segaar conjectured οἶνον, which is found in S.

§ 37 (D. 412, 26) ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς θεός: S omits υἱός, which appears as a marginal correction in V.

There are six cases in which a line or more was omitted by Ghisler, usually owing to homoeoteleuton, e.g. § 8 (D. 387, 19), after τί μέγα ἢ ὑπέρλαμπρον γήρας ἄγονον ἀμαρτημάτων; Mr. Barnard adds from the MSS. ὧν ἐπιθυμία τίκτουσι νεανικαὶ ἢ ὀργὴ ζέουσα ἢ ἔρος χρημάτων; § 30 (D. 407, 28) for <πρὸς> τοὺς ταῦτα μὴ παρασχόντας <ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ἐφ' ὅσον οὐκ ἐποιήσατε ἐν τούτων τῶν ἐλαχίστων οὐδὲ ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε> of Dindorf (where the words between brackets are due to previous editors), S has τοὺς ταῦτα μὴ παρασχόντας αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἐμβάλλει τὸ αἰῶνον, ὥς αὐτῷ μὴ παρεσχόκτας, the eye of the copyist having passed from παρασχόντας to παρεσχόκτας.

But the excellence of the edition is not simply due to the use made of the two MSS. The judgment of the editor is shown both in the improved punctuation and in the emendations adopted or suggested. One of the most striking of these occurs in § 13 (D. 392, 3), where the old reading ἐπιξενούσθαι Ζαχαρίῳ καὶ ἐλὲν καὶ Ματθαίῳ, is changed to ἐπιξενούται Ζ. καὶ Α. ενεὶ κ. M., Clement here distinguishing between Levi and Matthew, as in p. 595. I presume that S has ἐπιξενούται, but that is not distinctly stated. It would, I think, have been more satisfactory if all the information about the text had been given in the critical notes. We may assume, I suppose, that, where nothing is said, the text represents S, but I should like to have been sure of this in such a case as § 31 (p. 24, 18 Barnard) ὁ τοῦ κυρίου λελεγμένος, where I much prefer the old reading ὁ τῷ κυρίῳ λ. Again in § 2 (B. p. 3, 3) it is a pity, I think, that the conjecture given at the end (ἀνθρώποις for ἀνθρώπῳ ἦ) should not have appeared at the bottom of the page; and so frequently.

Great however as is the improvement of the text in the new edition, it still presents not a few cruxes on which I am tempted to add such emendations as have occurred to

me on a fresh perusal of the book. § 13 (p. 10, 32 B) τὴν δὲ δικαίαν κρίσιν ἐπιθεῖς, καὶ τὴν ἀδικον ἀφελὼν καταγγέλλει, Σήμερον σωτηρία κ.τ.λ., alluding to the story of Zacchaeus. Here the meaning of κρίσιν is not plain: if we read κτῆσιν, the sense might perhaps be 'conferring upon him the just possession but taking away the unjust' (i.e. by fourfold restitution and half given to the poor). I think however I prefer ἔκτισιν, which is used with ἐπιτιθέναι in Din. 107, 12 δεκαπλασίαν τοῦ τιμώματος τὴν ἔκτισιν ἐπιτιθέντας. The sense would then be 'imposing the just fine, but removing the unjust.' § 18 (p. 14, 16, B.) εἰ τοίνυν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐξοσόμενον...ἡ ψυχὴ...δὴλον ἦδη σαφὲς ὅτι αὐτῇ...σώζεται, read αὐτῇ for αὐτῇ. § 20 (p. 16, 1, B.) συνήδεσαν ἑαυτοῖς μήπω τὰ πάθη τέλεον ἀποτιθεμένοις. The present participle does not go well with τέλεον: Segaar suggested ἀποθεμένοις; I should prefer the perfect ἀποτεθειμένοις. § 21 (p. 17, 12, B.) τοῦτ' ἂν ἀπτοίτο ἦδη τοῖς ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐγγραφεσόμενοις. The old editions had τοῦτ' ἀνάπτοίτο; I should prefer τοῦτ' ἂν ἀνάπτοίτο, as we find this verb in the same construction just below (§ 29) τὰ πρωτεῖα τῆς ἀγάπης ἀνάπτει τῷ θεῷ. § 25 commenting on Mark x. 30 'houses and brethren with persecution,' Clement says 'Those who are called to life are neither without money nor without houses nor without brethren, for he has called even rich men, only in the way we have described, and brethren too in the same way, only being of one mind with one another and with Christ'; and then goes on τὸ δὲ μετὰ διωγμῶν ταῦτα ἕκαστα ἔχειν ἀποδοκιμάζει, which is translated in the note 'but it is the having these things with persecutions that He disallows.' But surely Christ nowhere disallows of persecutions: they are the mark of the true Christian. I believe that some such words as εἰπὼν τοῖς ἀναξίους have been lost before ἀποδοκιμάζει 'By saying that these blessings would be attended by persecutions he rejects the unworthy.' Compare Matt. 13, 21 γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἡ διωγμοῦ...σκανδαλίζεται. Just below Clement speaks of the soul being the prey of evil passions καὶ φάλλον ἐλπίδων καὶ φθαρτῶν ὀνειροπολημάτων. Should not we read φθαρτικῶν 'corrupting dreams,' § 31 (p. 24, 13, B.) αὐτὸν ζητεῖν τοὺς εὐ πεισομένους ἀξίους τε ὄντας τοῦ σωτήρος μαθητάς, read γε for τε. § 32 (p. 25, 6, B.) ὁ φίλος οὐκ ἐκ μίας δόσεως γίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅλης ἀναπαύσεως καὶ συνουσίας μακρᾶς. Perhaps ἀναπαύσεως is a corruption of ἀναπληρώσεως 'a full satisfying of all wants.' § 33 (p. 25, 1. 18 B.) 'It is better to benefit the unworthy than from

excess of caution *μηδὲ τοῖς σπουδαίοις περιπεσεῖν.* The final word can hardly be right. It is generally used of disasters. Possibly it represents [ὕ]πηρεσιν. § 36 (p. 27, 18 B.) 'the holy seed are sent into the world ὑπὸ μεγάλης οἰκονομίας καὶ ἀναλογίας τοῦ πατρὸς. Perhaps we should read ἀναγωγῆς 'man is sent into the world by God's ordaining and upbringing,' i.e. as a result of God's plan for training us. § 38 (p. 28, 31) 'Let not this thought remain in your mind so as to produce despair, if you were also to learn who is the rich man who has no place in heaven.' I think something must have been lost at the end of the first clause: at present there is nothing to explain τοῦτο. § 39 (p. 29, 1) is the order of εἰ ἦν δέ possible? (p. 29, 4) I cannot quite agree in the translation given at the end, 'if a man allow himself to be completely mastered by sins at first committed ignorantly or involuntarily, this man is altogether condemned by God.' The sentence which follows: παντὶ γὰρ τῷ ἐπιστρέψαντι...ἀνεύγασιν αἱ θύραι, and indeed the remainder of the paragraph, show that it is the abounding mercy of God which forms the subject of the preceding sentence. While agreeing with Ghisler that a negative is needed, I think its loss is most easily accounted for, if we insert οὐδὲ before οὗτος. Below l. 7 δέχεται τρισάσμενος πατήρ νῖδον ἀληθῶς μετανοῶντα, I should prefer τρισάσμενος.

There are some cases in which I think the editor has been too cautious in admitting emendations. (p. 2, l. 10 ff.) τοῦτο μὲν ἐξαιτουμένους παρὰ θεοῦ...τοῦτο δὲ λέγω διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ σωτῆρος ἱωμένους τὰς ψυχὰς. Here the note says 'λέγω may have slipped in owing to the frequency of the phrase τοῦτο δὲ λέγω.' Is it not simpler to suppose with Segaar that it stands for λόγῳ? § 14 (p. 11, 13) I think Segaar's ἀμουσίας should have taken the place of ἀποουσίας, and his οὐρανίον taken the place of οὐρανοῦ before βασιλείας in p. 12, 36, as we have βασιλείαν οὐράνιον in p. 24, 39, and it is the plural οὐρανῶν, not the singular, which is used in this phrase in pp. 15, 17, 23, &c. § 18 (p. 13, 28) τοὺς πλουσίους μαθηματικῶς ἀκουστέον τοὺς δυσκόλως εἰσελευσόμενους εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, μὴ σκαίως...μηδὲ σαρκινῶς. The older editors objected with reason to μαθηματικῶς, and I think it would have been well to have adopted Dindorf's μαθητικῶς, as we find μαθητικὴν ἀγούσα σχολήν in p. 8, 26, and in § 20 (p. 15, 32) we have the equivalent phrase καλῶς ἤκουσαν καὶ ὡς μαθηταὶ τοῦ παραβολικῶς λεχθέντος ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου. § 19 (p. 14, 30) τῷ κατὰ κόσμον πτωχῷ καὶ πλουσίῳ

κατὰ τὰ πάθη ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα [οὗ] πτωχὸς καὶ κατὰ θεὸν πλούσιος 'Ἀπόστηθι κ.τ.λ. Here the older editors inserted φησί after ἀπόστηθι, but in the note the omission of the verb of saying is justified by a reference to § 22 (p. 17, 17) ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ 'Ιησοῦς 'Ἀμὴν ὑμῖν λέγω. I think the omission is much harsher in the former passage, and would suggest that the superfluous οὗ represents an original φησί. § 25 (p. 19, 20) ὅταν (ἡ ψυχὴ)...καθάπερ κέντροις ἢ μύσφι, τοῖς προκειμένοις αὐτῇ πάθειν ἐξαμείσσηται. Here Segaar's προσκειμένοις is far more suitable than προκειμένοις. § 28 (p. 22, 1) 'The Master ἀνωθεν καταβαίνων ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀγεί τῷ λόγῳ τινὰ εἰς Ἱερικῶν.' The note here is 'Ghisler corrected to καταβαίνοντα, but the nom. though bold is perhaps possible in this graphic passage.' I think καταβαίνοντα is needed with ἀγεί τῷ λόγῳ ('represents one coming down'), and that the accusative would easily be changed to nom. before ἀγεί. § 31 (p. 24, 15) Segaar's φειδόμενος should certainly have taken the place of φειδόμενον ὧς, which plainly originated in the copyist's correction of the last syllable of φειδόμενον. Just below (l. 17) ἰλαρὸν δότερ ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός...δίχα γογγυσμῶν καὶ διακρίσεως καὶ λύτης καὶ κοινωνοῦντα, Segaar rightly omits the last καὶ. In one case the editor rejects, as I think without reason, an old reading which is supported by S. (§ 1, p. 1, 10 f.) τῆς περιουσίας καθ' αὐτὴν ἰκάνης οὐσης χανῶσαι τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν κεκτημένων...οἱ δὲ (B. has οἶδε) προσεκπλήσσονσι τὰς γνώμας τῶν πλουσίων. This appears to me to be a case of δὲ ἰν ἀποδοσι post participia absoluta, which Klotz (on Devar. ii. 372) illustrates by the following apposite quotation from Isocrates, δέον αὐτοὺς τὴν φρόνησιν ἀσκέειν μᾶλλον τῶν ἄλλων, οἱ δὲ χεῖρον παιδεύονται. I have noticed one misprint (p. 20, l. 10) ἀδέεστερον for ἐνδεέστερον, and suspect another in p. 29, 1, where Dindorf has τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν for B.'s τῶν αἰωνίων τῶν ἀγαθῶν, as in neither edition is there any note as to the MS. authority.¹

There are two passages in which I was at one time inclined to question the reading: § 13 (p. 10, 27) γυμνὸν σκεπάζει καὶ ἀστεγονοὶ σὺν ἄγοι, which I now think is corrected by Isa. 58, 7 πτωχοὺς ἀστέγους εἰσαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου, and by Nahum iii. 18, where the LXX. has ἐκδεχόμενος, but according to Schleusner some of the other versions have συνάγων 'ubi notat hospitio accipere.' The other is § 26 (p. 20, 7) ῥέπει πρὸς τοὺς πολυκτήμενας ad divites spectat, where I was

¹ Since this was written I have learnt from Mr. Barnard that both ἀδέεστερον and τῶν ἀγαθῶν are found in S.

inclined to read βλέπει, but am now satisfied by the parallel in Arist. *Plut.* 50 ὁ χρησμός εἰς τοῦτο ῥέπει.

I have gone so much into details, because the book is one which ought to secure a large sale, and, where so much pains has

been taken, I hold it to be both a duty and a pleasure for those whose work lies in the same field to help, so far as they can, to make the second edition an even greater success than the first.

J. B. MAYOR.

NUTT ON THE CELTIC DOCTRINE OF RE-BIRTH.

The Voyage of Bran to the Land of the Living, edited with translation by KUNO MEYER. With an Essay upon the Irish *Vision of the Happy Otherworld* and the *Celtic Doctrine of Rebirth*, by ALFRED NUTT. Volume II. The Celtic Doctrine of Rebirth. London: Nutt. 1897. Price 10s. 6d.

THE Science of Comparative Mythology is undergoing such extensive alterations and repairs that the business which it once did in the pre-historic antiquities of the Aryan peoples seems to be temporarily suspended. Doubtless when the hoardings are removed which at present screen it from the view, it will resume operations on a larger scale than ever. Meanwhile a junior concern, the Science of Comparative Antiquities, is seizing the opportunity to establish itself; and Mr. Alfred Nutt must ever be reckoned as having been amongst the foremost to venture on this new emprise. In his first volume (reviewed in the *C.R.* Vol. X. No. 2. pp. 121-124) he sought to show that the belief in a Happy Otherworld was found amongst the Celts and the Greeks and went back to times before the dispersion of the original Aryan people. In this volume he seeks to show that a belief in the transmigration of souls existed amongst Celts, Greeks and Hindoos and must also be regarded as a pre-dispersion belief: psychologically the belief is connected with the phenomena of ecstasy, especially as manifested in Dionysus-worship, which is itself but a form of an agricultural worship, common in its main features to Celts and Greeks.

One of the greatest difficulties which the Science of Comparative Antiquities has to surmount is that of distinguishing between what has been inherited from pre-dispersion times and what has been borrowed in post-dispersion times; and the difficulty is especially great in that branch of antiquities with which Mr. Nutt is concerned in his present

book, for in this department pre-historic men seem to have been as adept as modern authors in borrowing each other's ideas. It is therefore with sound scientific instinct that Mr. Nutt begins his second volume, as he began his first, by endeavouring to prove that the doctrine in question was not borrowed by the Celts. This is an operation of some difficulty and delicacy, for there is nothing in Comparative Antiquities, corresponding to Grimm's Law in Comparative Philology, which enables us to distinguish decisively between what is inherited and what has been borrowed. And the difficulty is enhanced in the case of Celtic material because the documents embodying it belong to Christian and comparatively late times. The first thing to do therefore is to establish by a comparison of texts the oldest form of any given tale presupposed by the existing literary variants; and that Mr. Nutt is especially competent for this indispensable and valuable preliminary work is shown by the high praise given to his first volume by such specialists as M. Gaston Paris, M. H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, M. H. Gaidoz, and Professor F. Y. Powell. In the non-Celtic student, the mere Saxon who does not know even how to pronounce such names as Cichmaine, Eochaid, etc., it would be impertinence to praise this part of Mr. Nutt's work; but one may express one's gratitude to the scholar who, like Mr. Nutt, makes accessible what otherwise would be a sealed book.

The oldest form of any given tale having been established, the next thing is to discover whether it or its incidents can be probably assigned to pre-Christian times. And here readers of the *Classical Review* who are not 'Celtisants' can form an independent opinion of their own, for the basis of the argument consists in certain passages from the Classics. In the Celtic stories the belief is postulated that a man, having died, may be born again in human form. Various classical authors state that the

Druids taught the doctrine of re-birth in human form. The conclusion indicated is therefore that the belief is a genuine, pre-Christian, Celtic belief. It is true that there are apparently only about half-a-dozen of these Celtic stories, and about eight classical references (some of which are possibly mere repetitions), but, however jealously sifted, they will be found, I believe, to leave a residuum of fact only to be explained on the hypothesis that the Celts of pre-Christian times believed in re-birth in human form. The fact of the matter is that this belief is so common amongst uncivilised peoples that what would in other cases rightly be considered a very slight amount of evidence is in this case quite sufficient. But most observers who have recorded instances of this belief as occurring amongst savages have ascribed its origin to the resemblance between a child and its parents or grandparents—a resemblance for which the savage accounts by the hypothesis that the grandparent or parent (if dead) has been re-born in the form of the child. There is nothing, as far as I know, to lead to the idea that this belief is associated amongst savages with the phenomena of ecstasy, or that it is confined to peoples who have reached the agricultural stage.

Another belief which Mr. Nutt postulates for the early Celts, and which is so common amongst savages that the postulate may be granted, is that men can be transformed into animals. But this seems to me not to be the same thing as transmigration of the soul. In transmigration, the man dies before he becomes an animal; in transformation, he does not. The soul which migrates leaves a dead body behind it; the man who is transformed does not.

To complete our account of Mr. Nutt's Celtic evidence, we must mention the case of Tuan MacCairill. 'The Christian classic learning which has so profoundly modified much in Irish tradition,' also produced an 'elaborate system of pre-Christian chronology modelled upon and synchronised with that of Biblical and classical antiquity...The main feature of this annalistic scheme is furnished by the so-called invasions of, or immigrations into, Ireland,' and 'a peculiarity of this highly artificial annalistic scheme is, that each successive race is supposed to have died out or vanished from mortal ken. The question naturally arose, by what means was the knowledge of past races handed down?' (pp. 76, 77). The answer is given by Tuan MacCairill; he

was there all the time, 320 years, saw everything and related it afterwards. For a hundred years he was a man, then he transformed himself into a stag for eighty years, then into a boar for twenty, then into an eagle for a hundred, and then into a salmon for twenty. Finally, he was re-born in human form. The question then is, Is the legend of Tuan, apart from the annals foisted into it, a genuine pre-Christian Celtic legend? or, Is it the invention of the Christian annalist, who wanted a framework for his scheme, and made it by combining two forms of incident (transformation into animal shape and re-birth in human form) which must have been fairly familiar to him from his knowledge of Celtic myths? To me it seems that the scheme is too philosophical to be a genuine piece of folk-lore. Tuan first lives on the earth for 100 years, then in the air for 100, and then in the water for 100 (if we take the account given in the Book of Ballymote). He spends three hundred years in animal form, and his transmigration takes the form of a cycle: he begins as human and ends human. All this is singularly like the Egyptian theory of transmigration, as recorded by Herodotus, ii. 123: 'the soul of man is immortal, and when the body perishes it enters the body of some animal; when it has performed the round of all creatures that are on the land and in the sea and in the air, it again enters a human body, and the round takes 3,000 years.' This may be a very easy and natural development of the simple, savage belief that a man may be re-born in human form. But there is no evidence to show that Celtic belief had taken this turn in pre-Christian times.

Having produced his Celtic evidence, Mr. Nutt turns to Greece. That the Greeks believed a man might be re-born in human form, is a proposition which I do not feel inclined to dissent from. Indeed, I once wrote in the *Classical Review* (June, 1895) to argue that certain Greek burial laws seemed to postulate the belief. But that the original Aryans had the belief, because the Greeks and Celts had, I am by no means certain. The idea was developed by the Algonkins, for instance, quite independently of the Greeks and Celts, and may have been reached by the Greeks and Celts quite independently both of one another and of the original Aryans. Indeed, if Mr. Nutt is right in associating the belief with agricultural worship, it cannot go back to Aryan times, because agriculture seems to be certainly later than the split between the

Hindo-Persians and the European branch of Aryans.

However, without undertaking to determine what the pre-dispersion Aryans did or did not think on this point, let us assume they did believe that a man could be re-born in human form. What can we infer from that fact? Most Aryan peoples dropped the belief so completely that no trace of it is left amongst them. The Celts never, at any rate in pre-Christian times, carried the conception any further, any more than the Algonkins did. The Hindoos added to it the belief that man could be re-born in animal shape; and, above all, they gave the belief an ethical character—the good man got a good birth, the bad man a bad one. Pythagoras taught transmigration not merely as a moral theory but as a religious doctrine, involving the notion of a day of judgment, and taught it in a form so closely resembling Egyptian notions that the balance of opinion still is in favour of the supposition that he borrowed his teaching from Egypt. Mr. Nutt, however, is inclined to ask if the Hindoos could develop a complicated theory of transmigration for themselves, why could not the Greeks? *A priori* reasons can, of course, be supplied—I have attempted some in *An Introduction to the History of Religion*—but the question is, after all, one of evidence. Are the resemblances between the Egyptian and the Pythagorean doctrine so remarkable that borrowing is the most probable explanation of them? And some weight must be allowed to the Greeks' own feeling that Pythagoreanism was an exotic.

Finally, Mr. Nutt returns to the Happy Otherworld, and argues with great force and ability that the views as to the next world which were taught in the Mysteries were purely Greek and Aryan in their origin and development, and were no more

borrowed than were the Hindoo views on the same subject. Now, so many races have independently attained for themselves to a belief in a state of future happiness for the good and of future punishment for the bad, that it would be foolish to suppose that the Greeks were incapable of doing so too. The odd thing is that there are no signs of any such development of ideas amongst the Greeks until just the very time when this belief began to manifest itself with great activity amongst the Northern Semites. Mr. Nutt thinks that if we assume the movement to have spread thence to the Greeks, we ought also to assume that it spread to the Hindoos, and this seems to him rather too much. I am not prepared to say it is not, but I will conclude with a quotation from Huxley (*Evolution and Ethics*, p. 104): 'The Ionian intellectual movement does not stand alone. It is only one of several sporadic indications of the working of some powerful mental ferment over the whole of the area between the Aegean and Northern Hindostan during the eighth, seventh and sixth centuries before our era. In these three hundred years prophetism attained its apogee among the Semites of Palestine; Zoroasterism grew and became the creed of a conquering race, the Iranic Aryans; Buddhism rose and spread with marvellous rapidity among the Aryans of Hindostan, while scientific naturalism took its rise among the Aryans of Ionia. It would be difficult to find another three centuries which have given birth to four events of equal importance. All the principal existing religions of mankind have grown out of the first three: while the fourth is the little spring, now swollen into the great stream of positive science.'

F. B. JEVONS.

FRIEDLÄNDER'S 'JUVENAL.'

D. Junii Juvenalis saturarum libri v, mit erklärenden Anmerkungen von LUDWIG FRIEDLÄNDER. (Leipzig: Hirzel). Pp. 612 and 108*, 8vo. 14 M.

PROF. FRIEDLÄNDER'S 'Juvenal' consists of, first, 120 pages of Introduction dealing with the life and literary merits of the satirist and the history of his text—this contributed in part by Prof. Bücheler—, secondly, the

sixteen satires with critical notes in Latin and explanatory notes in English, and, thirdly, a 'Register' with an apparently complete Index Verborum. In character, arrangement, and even in appearance the whole closely resembles its author's edition of 'Martial,' issued just ten years ago. The merits of that admirable work are known to all Latin scholars, its judgment, its learning, its taste, its terseness. I may

express my opinion, which is also the general opinion, of the present edition, by saying that perhaps it even surpasses its predecessor. It deserves an honourable place in every scholar's library.

The life of Juvenal, the subject with which the book opens, is an old puzzle. Here is Prof. Friedländer's solution, familiar in part to readers of his 'Sittengeschichte.' Juvenal was born about A.D. 60, and in his youth probably served in the army, holding one of the 'Militiae equestres' and as an officer, perhaps, visiting Britain, Egypt and other provinces with which he seems personally familiar. He retired soon, possibly because he failed to get promotion—passages in his writings suggest such disappointment—and about 90 came to reside in Rome. Here he stayed, studying rhetoric and enjoying literary society, especially (till 98) that of Martial; here, later, he wrote his Satires (115–130). If he was exiled (which cannot be decided), it was before 110; if he was *quingennalis* of Aquinum, he may have left Rome for a year for the purpose. It is an attractive sketch of a career in which (so far as one knows) every detail is possible; its one difficulty, I think, is the date of the Satires. Juvenal, as is well known, refers specifically to three or four events which occurred in Trajan's later years or under Hadrian. Prof. Friedländer combines these references with the presupposition that Juvenal wrote his poems in one definite period. Thus he obtains the limit of fifteen years (in round numbers) between about 115 and 130. But the presupposition seems, at least, needless, and the references in question occur chiefly in the latter part of the Fourth and the Fifth Book. The whole atmosphere of the first three, perhaps of the first four Books—that is, two-thirds or three-quarters of the whole—the personages mentioned in them, the resemblances to Martial, and many other details, reek of Domitian's reign. Juvenal promised, in his first Satire, to deal chiefly with the dead, but he can hardly have lived so wholly in the past as to write or publish in 115 a satire on the men and manners of nearly thirty years before, all the more when those men and manners had been largely swept away by the downfall of Domitian. If he did this, it is certainly a literary problem of considerable magnitude. It is surely more probable that these Satires were published soon after 96, when the memory of the third Flavian was yet fresh. We may venture further. The Flavian colouring (if I may so call it) is

most marked in Satires i–vii, less so in viii–x, while in xi and following it fades wholly out. Again, Satires xi and following show a new and weaker manner; they also contain nearly all the references to events later than 115. It is credible that Juvenal began to write before or about 100, and to publish soon after that date, and that he continued to write at intervals until 130, gradually dropping his Flavian allusions as the Flavian age faded from his and the popular memory, changing his manner with this change in matter and growing weaker in style as he grew old. Whether he wrote his Satires in their present order, whether he revised, remodelled, re-edited, are problems which it is safer at present not to raise.

I may pass by the rest of Prof. Friedländer's Introduction, excellent and complete as it is. The sections of most interest, those dealing with the history of the text, have been already expounded admirably to readers of this review by Mr. S. G. Owen, whose own edition of the poet we are all awaiting. I will only express my regret that the chapter on 'Juvenals Versbau' contributed by another hand, should seem to me below the general level. It contains numerous statistics, but statistics, popular as they are in contemporary scholarship, are very blind guides. They have certainly not enabled their compiler to grip the central fact about Juvenal's 'Versbau,' that his rhythm is Virgilian and not Horatian. In many respects—use of colloquialisms, use of dialogue, indifference to logical sequence of thought—Juvenal followed the tradition of the old Satura. In his rhythms he broke away, and that fact is surely noteworthy. For the rest, the Introduction is complete, interesting and judicious.

The commentary is equally admirable; two of its merits seem to deserve special notice. In the first place it exhibits a rare combination of fulness and brevity. Everything is adequately explained, and yet text and notes, both printed in a fine legible type, together occupy no more than 480 pages. It is a fault of the present age to confound length with learning and the word 'short' with the word superficial. It is therefore a great gain that a scholar with Prof. Friedländer's deserved reputation should set a contrary example. It is a further gain that he should give us a full and brief edition of Juvenal. We have, of course, one admirable edition, Mr. Mayor's monumental work. But Mr. Mayor's monument is Juvenal's tomb, while the smaller English and foreign editions are too

small for advanced students. Prof. Friedländer gives us a commentary of the right length and the right learning. And, in the second place, his notes combine in an unusual degree a command of many subjects: Latin, history, antiquities. The interpretation of Juvenal demands this combination to a rather special degree, though editors (Mr. Mayor apart) have rarely recognized the fact and have in consequence written oddly, for instance, about the Roman army. Prof. Friedländer, with aid from Prof. Hirschfeld, Dr. Klebs (who supplies some valuable 'Nachträge') and others, deals adequately with all problems.

I conclude by noticing a few unimportant points, and first I. 158 *cum fas esse putet curam sperare cohortis*. The command of a cohort commenced the Equestrian career, on which Juvenal himself had embarked with more labour than profit. He is naturally indignant at the spendthrift's easy entrance. Probably the latter was of senatorial birth (*maiorum censu*), had lost or resigned his rank (Tac. Ann. ii. 48, xii. 52, etc.), and, through influence, had been consoled with a salaried post. I may add that I see no reason for saying that either *cura* or *sperare* are here used technically. *Cura* = 'command' is common in Imperial Latin, but I very much doubt whether, even on military inscriptions, it ever denotes special or extraordinary command, as is sometimes affirmed. *Optio ad spem ordinis* and similar phrases (Ephem. iv. 471) are certainly technical, but only of certain promotions; they do not apply here.

I. 67. *Signator falsi qui se lautum*, etc. No one, except Mr. Mayor, not even Prof. Friedländer, has quite faced the fact that while the context is about forging, the word *signator* means 'a witness,' and Mr. Mayor's theory of a friend 'called in at the mortal agony' seems open to the objection that five witnesses were required. The Cornelian Forgery Law apparently provided for the case of witnesses who knowingly signed a forged deed by which they were to benefit, and who therefore were accomplices. I

suppose Juvenal's *signator* must have forged in some such manner, perhaps concocting the will as well as sealing it. Witnesses, however, are not often mentioned as tampering with wills, while some doubt arises about *falsi*, for the text in P seems only half certain and *falsum*, though constantly denoting the crime of forgery, does not seem to denote a forged document.

I. 155. *Tigellinum*. There seems some reason to think that the monster's name was Ofonius, not Sofonius or Sophonius, though *nomina* formed from barbaric, or, at least, non-Roman names, do occur in the early Empire.

II., 35. Dr. Klebs is plainly right in referring Juvenal's and Horace's *Scauros* to the Aurelius Scaurus who fell nobly in Gaul in 105 B.C.; the Aemilii Scauri, who were prominent from about B.C. 120—A.D. 20, seem to have been throughout a bad lot. But the reference may be also to Scauri unknown to us. Virgil's *Gracchi genus* (A vi. 842) is possibly the same.

III., 64. *Gentilia tympana*. Dr. Klebs renders 'foreign' a sense which he finds also in Horace's *terrui Urbem, terrui gentes*, Tacitus' *duret gentibus amor nostri* and elsewhere. The sense is common enough in the fourth century, and, as the 'tribe' was an uncivilized thing, neither Roman nor Greek, the Roman was on the verge of this sense whenever he used *gens* to mean a 'tribe.' But the first instance I know of *gentilis* 'foreign' belongs to A.D. 232, and the frequent occurrence of the adjective in Tacitus to mean 'native' shows that we may expect that sense here, where it suits perfectly. Besides, one may object to Dr. Klebs that a Syrian from the Orontes was not a 'foreigner' but a subject of Rome and native of a Roman province. In Horace, I suppose, *terrui gentes* means 'terrified the World,' a suitable antithesis to Rome. Tacitus in the words quoted comes, naturally enough, nearer to the later sense, but he probably means no more by *gentibus* than uncivilized tribes.

F. HAVERFIELD.

PAYNE'S HARVEY AND GALEN.

Harvey and Galen; the Harveian Oration delivered to the Royal College of Physicians, Oct. 9th. 1896. By J. F. Payne, M.D., Oxon., &c. London, 1897. 2s. 6d. net.

If we have delayed the due notice of this excellent little book we may truly say that

its value is not transitory; until the author himself, or some student of like competence widens and enriches the argument in a fuller treatise the present essay has a permanent claim on our attention. Dr. Payne is one of the few physicians who has combined historical scholarship with large

experience and success in the field of modern science and practice. It is needless to say that in discussing such subjects as the present a practical expert has a great advantage over the closet student.

And this advantage is eminent in every page of the Oration. Dr. Payne's text is the establishment of the true relation of Galen to Harvey; and in such an inquiry a survey of the historical position of other great physicians, such as Linacre and Caius, is incidentally undertaken. The enormous volume of the works of Galen has been one of the chief obstacles to a proper understanding of his real claims on our gratitude as a pioneer of scientific medicine. Galen, in a way, confesses this, 'If,' he says, 'I do write long books it is not my fault; it is the fault of the other people who will write books full of so many wretched arguments.' It is against his true appreciation that thus so much of his work had but an ephemeral value; had he been less of a rhetorician and philosopher his scientific merits would have been more eminent. As it is, his works are too voluminous for ready study; and the edition which we were to have had from the learned pen of Dr. Daremberg never got beyond the second volume. As Dr. Payne says, 'His original observations, which are many and of great value, have to be dug out of his theoretical expositions like fossils from a rock.'

We owe therefore no inconsiderable debt to Dr. Payne in so far as he has prospected Galen's claims and has done already some very efficient digging. It is not too much to say that no one can read Dr. Payne's oration without receiving a fresh conception of Galen and an impulse to the further study of this most interesting ancient.

Dr. Payne points out that to Galen Harvey owed much more than the transcendental advantage of scholarly tradition. Through Linacre and Caius Harvey was brought into direct contact with the very work and method of Galen. Linacre contributed a knowledge of Greek and an enthusiasm for the new learning; Caius also much Greek and Latin with a zeal for anatomy and a training in clinical medicine. Harvey in his turn had a profound knowledge of anatomy, some experimental methods, and a great enthusiasm for Aristotle. It is likely that Harvey would have admitted his great debt to Galen had it not fallen to his lot to resist the dogmatic infallibility of Galen, and to demand for the direct investigation of nature a place before the worship of scriptures. But, after all, to the Galenists

clinical medicine owed its revival; the Galenists and 'medical humanists,' especially in the study of anatomy and botany, were turning to the investigation of nature. Dr. Payne rightly praises Vesalius for correcting the errors of Galen; but his researches were based upon the system which he destroyed, and 'it is hard to see how anatomy would have arisen when it did, had Galen's works perished.'

What honour or gratitude has Galen received for this signal service? In modern times scanty praise or none. The orator goes so far as to assert that there is perhaps no other instance of a man of equal intellectual rank who has been so persistently misunderstood and even misrepresented—a reaction no doubt from the extravagant homage formerly paid to him. Anatomy is little regarded in the Hippocratic treatises, and, but for Galen, the great discovery of Harvey might never have been made. In this field Harvey stands face to face with Galen; nor is there any third figure that can be compared with them, except that of the founder of biological science, Aristotle himself.

In a very happy passage Dr. Payne tells us how the mere accumulation of correct data was of little avail in the discovery of the circulation. Why did not Vesalius, or Fabricius, or Colombo, whose anatomical knowledge was quite as complete as was required, get near it? After comparing such data to a word puzzle in which a number of letters are thrown on the table to make a word, the orator says that the 'master mind of Harvey arranged the letters in the right order, and so the word was spelt for all the world to read.' To do this required that high and peculiar faculty of synthesis which is rightly regarded as an attribute of genius, and is closely allied to the poetical imagination.

In the next place, Dr. Payne endeavours to estimate Galen's relation to Aristotle; and even to modern physiology. He says that often a difference in language makes Galen's views seem much more different from modern physiology than they really were; especially in regard to his study of the nervous system, and the old and famous doctrine of the 'animal spirits.' If Galen seemed to oppose Aristotle it was because the use made of the great biologist's authority was an unintelligent one; the Peripatetics talked about anatomy, but they would not dissect. 'Come and see for yourselves' was his constant cry. Galen's standard of reasoning was perfectly sound nevertheless,

judged by the criteria of Bacon or Mill. On the mechanism of the respiration, indeed, Galen, as Dr. Payne points out, was actually in advance of Harvey.

Every physiologist should read what Dr. Payne says concerning Galen's investigations into the nature of the brain and nervous system. Instead of the adumbrations and analogies of Aristotle, Galen gives actual proofs. His experimental research into the spinal cord by sections at different levels, and by half sections, was most remarkable. 'It is quite modern in precision and completeness.' And his application of his physiological knowledge in diagnosis is no less striking. We cannot look without sympathy upon the spectacle of Galen wrestling with the philosophers, and striving to bring them to the evidence of facts and the teaching of

nature. Even at the present day such an example is not without its application. We owe our thanks to Dr. Payne, not so much for setting us right in this detail of text and interpretation or in that, but because he has changed our perspective of more than one of the most interesting of the world's benefactors.

Although in the brief space of this oration, and in the notes which are supplied in the printed edition, we have a compact presentation of the outcome of long and fruitful study, yet I trust that Dr. Payne will occupy his scanty leisure in developing his thesis, and in contributing on a larger scale a new and original chapter to the history of medicine.

T. CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

VAN LEEUWEN AND DA COSTA'S EDITION OF THE ODYSSEY.

Homeri Odysseae Carmina cum apparatu critico ediderunt J. VAN LEEUWEN et MENDES DA COSTA. Editio altera passim aucta et emendata. Accedunt tabulae tres. Pars Prior. Carm. I—XII. Lugduni Batavorum apud A. W. Sijthoff. MDCCCXCVII. 3 M.

In preparing their second edition the editors have had the advantage of using the collation of G F P by Molhuysen. This circumstance alone suffices to make the book indispensable for serious students of the poet. The preface, *Manuscriptorum Notitia*, is also deserving of careful attention. Part I. gives a list of the authorities for the text, including the papyri, and arranges them, as far as possible, according to their relations to one another. Part II. shows how in many passages recent investigation has found in old MSS. readings that before depended on late MSS. or on mere conjecture. Here the importance of G is very evident. The editors maintain nevertheless that even the most cautious cannot always abstain from conjecture, and support their view by a list of passages in which all or most MSS. agree in error. '*Textui igitur talibus vitiis inquinato aut hisce locis aut alibi passim anxie inhaerere malle quam suo stare iudicio . . . superstitionis est merae. Luculenter autem ostendunt huiusmodi errores artis-
simis cognationis vinculis cohaerere cunctos nostros codices. Non minus tamen certum est*

optima exemplaria GFPHMXUn . . . neque alterum ex altero esse ducta neque inter ea duo plurave esse quae eundem habeant patrem. Itaque quamquam de codicum utilitate non nimis magnifice sentiendum esse vidimus, non tamen impune ex iis unum alterumve omnino neglexerit quispiam.'

On two passages mentioned in this introduction the reviewer would like to offer some remarks. On p. xxvi. the editors seem to be sure of the correctness of *πεδόθεν* in v. 295 *πεδόθεν φίλοι εἰσίν*. This is the reading of P. and Eust., while G (Molhuysen) and the rest of Ludwig's MSS. have the impossible *παῖδόθεν*. May not Schulze, *Quaestiones epicae*, p. 86, n. 1 have hit the mark with his *παῖθεν* "*a puero*," *quod in παῖδόθεν, deinceps in πεδόθεν corruptum est*? Again p. xxi. the editors accept the reading peculiar to G of ρ 347

αἰδώς δ' οὐκ ἀγαθὴ κεχηρμένον ἄνδρα κομίζειν

in preference to the vulgate

ἀ. δ' οὐκ ἀ. κεχηρμένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρῑναί.

This they find obscure, while G gives precisely what is wanted, viz. something to encourage a beggar to beg: '*pudor non est utilis ad virum egenum nutriendum*. But Monro's interpretation of the vulgate, H.G.² p. 198 'shame is not good to be beside a needy man (is not a good "backer" for)'

seems to meet all the requirements of the case. Would any difficulty have been felt in the vulgate, which is also the reading of Plato, *Charmid.* 161 A and *Lach.* 201 B, if it had been cast in the impersonal form commoner in later Greek, οὐκ ἀγαθὸν αἰδῶ κ.τ.λ. ? Further, as the editors point out, what G gives is identical with the correct reading of Hesiod, *Op.* 317. Now the scribe of G was very liable to write down not what he had

before him, but some parallel passage: cf. Molhuysen, *De tribus Od. codd.* p. 22: is it not possible that he has given us here a parallel passage from Hesiod ?

It is somewhat disappointing to find that the *tabulae tres* are those already published by Molhuysen.

C. M. MULVANY.

Queen's College, Benares.

NIESE'S SUMMARY OF ROMAN HISTORY.

Handbuch der Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, herausgegeben von Dr. IWAN VON MÜLLER. Dritter Band, 5. Abtheilung. *Grundriss der römischen Geschichte nebst Quellenkunde*, von Dr. B. NIESE. Zweite Auflage. 5m. (München, Beck.)

PROFESSOR NIESE's *Grundriss* (pp. 1-248) gives a useful summary of Roman history as far down as the end of the empire in the West (A.D. 476),—a much more reasonable place to leave off than the accession of Augustus, generally observed by English writers. Its exact object is said to be 'eine brauchbare kurze Zusammenfassung der wichtigsten und glaubhaft überlieferten Thatsachen,' but from the necessity of the case it includes a little more. There must always be a certain element of conjecture about ancient history. The history has to be restored or recovered; the documents are defective; conjecture must therefore play a part. So we should describe the Professor's new book rather as 'a summary of what is known or probably conjectured, stripped of the mythical, the picturesque and the personal, and set forth with solid reasonableness.' But solidity is not always lively, and the work is cut into sections,—a practice which is, though we hardly know why, depressing. In fact, the *Grundriss* does not seem to us to be everybody's book. It is rather for those who know a good deal already, who can take up allusions, and who understand something of the theory of evidence generally and of the nature of the evidence for Roman history in particular. It is not a readable and popular sketch, but a trustworthy encyclopaedia-article, and it has the defects as well as the merits of that kind of composition.

Herr Niese has tried to pack too much into a small compass. The story is overlong for the pages, and in addition there is

the *Quellenkunde*. The paragraphs which deal with the latter subject suffer from the want of some general theory or introduction. Simple as the theory may be it needs to be laid down somewhere. The student who uses the book will often wonder why a story, a view, or a conjecture is rejected as insufficiently supported, because his attention is nowhere drawn to the general rules of evidence with which this particular case does not comply. Indeed the treatment of early and of republican times is somewhat too summary and too little critical all through. Views or stories are not so much discussed as summarily rejected:—"ruht auf unsicherer Grundlage": "diese Vermutungen sind sehr zweifelhaft": "freilich manches sehr zweifelhafte vorgebracht wird." Of course all this expresses a right and cautious attitude; nothing could be better than the general remark that "In Wahrheit können wir über diese Königszeit nichts bestimmtes wissen": but the attitude wants justifying somewhere if ancient history is to be a useful "Disziplin." Here again is a sound judgment, but one requiring explanation point by point for readers not familiar with the line of inquiry:—

"The latter (not the earliest) form which Roman story took, found to some extent in Cicero, but especially in Livy and Dionysius, has been greatly worked up under rhetorical and antiquarian influences, and in telling of the older political struggles it follows the model of struggles later than the Gracchi, uses Greek analogies, and monotonously repeats similar incidents."

The story of the heroic resistance offered by Saguntum to Hannibal is, it appears, "Rhetorenarbeit ohne Wert." Perhaps so, but why? In short Niese's attitude as a doubting Thomas is judicious, but, practising it as he does he will not impart it to any one else or make a good model. Much more of the principles of doubt in these matters may

be learned from C. Wachsmuth's *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*.

On the other hand there are times when Homer nods and Niese accepts blindly. The imputation of motives has charms for everyone, even—or especially, for students of ancient history. It is no doubt deplorably necessary now and again, but the conscientious writer (such a man as the late Mr. George Long) takes care that his readers know the difference between the facts handed down and the motives ascribed. Far too lightly does Niese set forth in three lines the assurance that Spurius Cassius, Spurius Maelius, and M. Manlius all aimed at a despotism. One is equally surprised, too, to find him taking as probable the guess that Servius Tullius was really the last of the Roman kings, and considering the *Panegyricus* of Pliny a 'wichtige Quelle.' Here a little suspicion would be in place.

For some time now the centre of gravity of new Roman histories has been shifted, and the chief interest of each fresh one has lain, not in the style, not in views of personal character (though Mommsen's are certainly racy), but in the conjectures on constitutional history. Various causes have put us recently into possession of many new keys to questions of that sort, and in consequence we have had a multitude of theories through which the study is still groping its way, and among which it has not arrived at many very fixed conclusions. In dealing with these theories, especially about the later times, Niese is perhaps seen at his best. He knows which to omit and which to mention, and we can only regret that he has little space in which to explain or discuss. He has some very judicious remarks as to the exact point of time at which we are to say that the Roman Empire begins, deciding for Jan. 16, B.C. 27; and he declares that 'Augustus' work can only be called a restoration of freedom if we think of the Civil Wars and of the Triumvirate, not if we are comparing the old days': but the pages given to the constitutional character of the principate are too few (pp. 177–181). We are glad to see that he is not enthusiastic for Mommsen's term of *Dyarchy* as expressing a union of the old senatorial government and the new principate. Augustus' apparent

arrangement was indeed 'eine Verbindung unvereinbarer Gegensätze,' and the new name, if convenient, is essentially misleading. Yet Niese makes Diocletian's rule a more distinct epoch in the growth of monarchical power than we can. We all feel of course a difference from the time of Diocletian onward, yet it is not easy to put it into words which will not apply to earlier rulers. 'With Diocletian,' he says, 'begins outspoken monarchy and an entire setting aside of the old constitution and of the senate.' But monarchy could not be much more outspoken than the Emperor Gaius made it, and the senate could hardly feel more really set aside than under Nero, Domitian, or Aurelian. Indeed we find Niese saying in another place 'the monarchy was no less complete under the emperors from Nerva to M. Aurelius than before, in spite of consideration then shown to the senate; it was quite rooted.'

Niese is laudably cautious in his handling of Tiberius and Nero, subjects which belong half to constitutional, half to personal history. The foreign policy of the early emperors is treated together, and a general unbroken view is thus obtained, of great interest. The author declines (like Finlay) to recognise the Antonine period as that of greatest happiness, enumerating with some force the first plain signs of decay then perceptible in the Roman world.

No literary history is included in the *Grundriss* except where literature directly touched politics, as in the cases or assumed cases of Virgil, Lucan, and one or two other writers; Catullus is strangely passed by. The account of Cicero is interesting, but too compressed. Niese certainly does not rate Cicero as high as Cicero rated himself; he treats him rather in politics with a cool indifference which reminds one of Sallust. But he does not forget that Cicero has other claims to immortality than what the Catilinarian conspiracy gave him, and his judgment of the high after-importance of the stylist and philosopher, expressed in few words, coincides with the fuller treatment of the subject by Th. Zielinski in his recent *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*.

F. T. RICHARDS.

ZERETELI ON GREEK TACHYGRAPHY.

GREGORIUS ZERETELI. *De Compendiis scripturae codicum graecorum praecipue Petropolitano et Mosquensium anni nota instructorum.* Accedunt 30 tabulae. Petropoli typis academiae Caesareae scientiarum. MDCCCLXXXVI.

PATRIOTISM knows no law, but a manual of Greek contractions in Russian, must, if the book is intended for use outside Petersburg, fail in its object, and the publisher will have cause to regret that Mr. Zereteli did not array his observations in either of the classic tongues of palaeography—the native or the acquired language of Montfaucon. It is true that in a palaeographical handbook the letterpress sinks to its lowest value; the plates for the most part explain themselves, and so few general conclusions can be drawn in the subject that the reader, if annoyed, need not seriously lament his ignorance. The learning and kindness of the Rev. L. J. M. Bebb has unlocked for my benefit the purport and arrangement of this handbook.

Mr. Zereteli begins with an introduction of forty-three pages, in which the names of Gomperz, Gitlbauer, and Wessely, emerging more or less disguised from the paragraphs of Russian script, guarantee that the information is up to date. The origin, however, and early history of Greek tachygraphy has still to be told; Wessely's paper (*Denkschriften der k. Akad. der Wiss. in Wien*, Band XLIV. Abhandl. 4, 1895) is a notable attempt, but the material for the inquiry is still unpublished, and until the Sibyls who keep the keys of papyrus have done with tying theological squibs to the tail of the Nonconformist conscience, speculation on the prae-minuscule stage of compendia must be premature.

Mr. Zereteli follows with a collection, arranged alphabetically, of letters and syllables that are expressed by symbols.

Part of these are taken from dated MSS. at Petersburg and Moscow, but to them Mr. Zereteli has added *en bloc* all that have been gathered by previous inquirers. The necessity for such a collection is not obvious, for the time for a final conspectus of compendia is still far off; and the proportion, both in number and in value, of the Russian additions is not great. (In the plates the Petersburg forms have no numeral attached, the Moscow are distinguished by 2, the old examples by 3.) By some fatality dated MSS. are as a rule barren of graphical peculiarities, and the Russian minuscules are evidently ordinary types of Eastern ecclesiastical MSS. The editor's diligence and system are admirable, and it is not his fault if his material was not richer. His analysis of the earliest dated minuscule MS. (A.D. 835) is worth having, but the most solid contribution the book makes is the abundant list of examples from MSS. of the thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. This ungrateful labour, together with the wealth of facsimiles of these centuries provided by M. Henri Omont, should suffice to establish their usage.

Search for abbreviations within minuscule writing may still be pursued in two directions. In minuscule MSS. generally, dated and undated, of all ages but principally 900–1100, a certain, though small, harvest remains to be reaped. The process is very long, and can only be undertaken by a librarian or someone having constant access to a library. Besides this general field, the so-called Italian or Lombardic Greek minuscule MSS., written in the south of Italy and now nearly all among the *Vaticani graeci* contain a rich vein of compendia, as yet scarcely worked. The reviewer possesses some store of both, and holds them at the disposition of the enthusiastic publisher.

THOMAS W. ALLEN.

ARNOLD AND CONWAY ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK AND LATIN.

The Restored Pronunciation of Greek and Latin, with Tables and Practical Explanations, by E. V. ARNOLD and R. S. CONWAY. Second Edition. Cambridge: at the University Press. Price 1s.

THE scheme of 'restored' pronunciation, prepared by Professors Arnold and Conway,

and officially sanctioned by their colleagues in the University of Wales, ran the gauntlet of criticism at the time of its publication some two years and a half ago, and met with a general welcome. There is therefore little to be said about the second edition, except to recognise that it has been improved by the removal of a few ambiguous or misleading

expressions. In the first instance it wisely aimed at no originality in its main features: they are to be found in all the best recent grammars; and the noteworthy part consisted in its careful adaptation to the needs of Welsh students. It is strange to find no reference, where the evil consequences of the conventional 'English' pronunciation are pointed out, to the confusion which it causes in the understanding of inflexional and other changes: e.g. *caedo* and *cecidī*, *audacter* and *audaciter*. It is open to question whether *grandfather* is a good example for *ā* and *ā*: surely the pronunciation of the second *a* as long is both common and legitimate. It may be doubted whether *z* was always *sd*; e.g. in *Zmyrna*, or whether there are any words borrowed from Celtic, beginning with *rh*: *rheda* is of course an illegitimate spelling; are the writers possibly thinking of *Rhenus*? Whatever date we may assign for the change

of aspirated mutes or 'plosives' into spirants—a question perhaps not yet settled, certainly not by Miss Dawes's thesis—it hardly took place first in modern Greek; and the softened or sibilated pronunciation of *c*, *g*, *t* before *i*, etc., certainly came about in late Latin, and should not have been apparently limited to English and other modern European languages. The writers show good judgment in dealing with the question of 'hidden quantities,' recognising their importance for phonetics, but remembering that they should be disregarded as a rule in practice. The scheme, as a whole, deserves to be widely adopted; it may be remarked that it is in all points virtually identical with that which has been in use for some five and twenty years in one at least of the colleges of the Victoria University.

A.S.W.

NOTES ON BACCHYLIDES.

SOME of the following notes have been anticipated in the *Athenaeum* or elsewhere; in such cases I have occasionally erased my own, but generally let it stand in the form in which it already stood when the other appeared. Hence, e.g. the crude form of the note on v. 26.

There is so much adverse criticism of Mr. Kenyon's edition in them that I should like first to add my testimony to the value of the very important work which he has done. The defect of the edition is the faulty manner in which the metre is treated.

i. 1. *βαθυδείλον* if right at all, would mean 'sunny,' I think.

3. *ἔπλε δέ!*

32. *νόσων.*¹

42. To save a monstrous piece of scansion read *χρόνον οὐδ' ἔλαχεν τιμάν*, which also improves the sense. Cf. frag. 48 and Longinus ix. 3. I keep *οὐδὲ* as nearest the MS. but *οὐκ* would be more natural.

iii. 5. [*φέρον*]το.

22. Looks like *ἀγλαΐζεθ' ᾧ πᾶρ' ἄριστος* *ἄλβων.*² But this will not suit if the previous

¹ A Scotch friend (they do not teach the elements of Greek verse in Scotland, I believe, nor apparently in some other places) entreats me to explain *why*? I do not wish to insult the readers of the *Review* by explaining the elements of verse to *them*; let my inquisitive friend look up some introduction to the subject.

² [See also notes by Tyrrell and Richards.]

line is right. Perhaps *ἀγλαΐζε τῷ πᾶρ' ἄριστος* *ἄλβων.*

26. *κρίσιν!* cf. *Il.* A. 5.

27. Is [*ἐάλωσαν*] lyrical? [*ἐλήφθησαν*]?

48. *τόσ' εἶπε καὶ ἀβροβάταν κέλευσεν*
ἄπτειν ξύλινον δόμον.

A man cannot tell (as Bacon has it) whether *ἀβροβάταν* or *Ἀβροβάταν* be the more trifier. In my opinion Bacchylides wrote *ἀβροβατών* (or *ἀβροβατέων*). Mr. Kenyon is, I think, mistaken in saying that *ἀβροβάται* at *Persae* 1072 is practically a synonym for Persian; Aeschylus meant it, I imagine, to be predicative, and the line means, 'wail, treading softly,' as mourners do. 'And Agag came unto him delicately, saying, Surely the bitterness of death is past.' Similarly it is natural for the poet to say that Croesus, 'stepping delicately' as a mourner in a funeral procession, gave orders to light the pyre. But he was already on the pyre. Not necessarily; at 34 the word used is *ἐπίβαινε*, not *ἐπέβη*, and he would give the order while going up. Hence possibly came the *ω* erased by the writer before *-αν*.

63. *σοὶ μὲν Ἑλλάδ' ἔχουσιν, οὔτις.*

There is one syllable short, and what it is that has dropped out can easily be guessed. Croesus sent more gifts to Apollo than any other mortal; Hiero, goes on the poet, has

sent more than any other *Greek*. Read then ὅσοι γε μὴν, the emphasis being thus thrown strongly on 'Ἑλλάδ'—'Howbeit of all who dwell in *Greek* lands.'

64. Read: ὦ μεγαίνητος Ἱέρων, θελήσει
[αὐχέϊ]ν σέο πλείονα χρυσὸν
[Λοξί]α πέμψαι βροτῶν.
[εὖ, λέγ]ειν πάρεστιν ὅσ-
τις μὴ φθόνῳ πιαίνεται
[εἰστα]λὴ φιλιππον ἄνδρ' ἀ[ρ]ήμιον.¹

The ἀνὴρ φίλιππος is Hiero plainly, not Bacchylides. I at first proposed αἰνέειν, but with great doubt about the uncontracted infinitive; Prof. Housman improved it to εὖ λέγειν.

Since this was written Mr. Nairn has also proposed αἰνέειν and βροτῶν. With φθόνῳ πιαίνεται compare *Pyth.* ii. 56. For μεγαίνητος cf. Hermann's restoration of *Pyth.* i. 92.

Hiero seems to be digammated here and in 92. Observe also how his name is brought out at the same place in the strophe at 4, 64, 92, no doubt with some special musical effect.

71. The accent in the papyrus is against Κῶν and I rather fear that Cos and Merops have no business here. Μερο- may very well mean nothing but *mortal*, or μέρος may be the true reading.

77. [νῦ] of course, not νῖφ.

81. πετήκοντ' ἔτα can have nothing to do with Hiero's age. If my doctor says to me: 'Your heart is bad, you may die to-morrow or may live fifty years,' what does that prove about my age at the time? Well, it might prove that I was not very old; but here the words are not said to Hiero at all, but by Apollo to Admetus as a general maxim. Cf. Anacreon 8, ἔτα πετήκοντά τε καὶ ἑκατὸν Τάρτηρσοῦ βασιλεύσαι.

I can by no means agree with Mr. Nairn in advocating ὁ βουκόλος (Kenyon) at 77; ὁ ἀναξ' Ἀπόλλων ὁ βουκόλος might do in Aristophanes. Professor Jebb's ἑκαβόλος is surely better than that.

88. π[ρο]έτα is at any rate better than παρέντα. It is all very well to talk of leaving one's youth behind, but who ever heard of leaving old age behind? Besides Hiero was not an old man at all according to Mr. Kenyon's note. Possibly γ' ἀφέντα (γ' Marindin).

90. μινύθη?²

96. Prof. Housman called my attention to the difficulty of καλῶν. To him therefore

as much as to me is due the then pretty obvious βαλῶν.³

v. 6. I do not feel sure that εὐθυδίκων would not be better.

8. Put a full stop after νόφ, and keep ἦ with the MS.

v. 9. ὑφάνας
ἔμνον' ἀπὸ ζαθέας νάσον ξένος ὑμετέραν
πέμ-
πει κλεινὰν ἐς πόλιν
χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας κλεινὸς θεράπων.
ἐθέλει δέ

Mr. Walker is clearly right in getting rid of the superfluous syllables. He reads πλεῖ for πέμπει and ejects δέ, but thus leaves a curious asyndeton, which seems too abrupt; there are plenty of other asyndeta in Bacchylides, but none, I think, quite like this; it is not a passage of animated narrative. If, as Mr. Walker says, these verses have been 'cooked' in the supposed interests of metre, we need not invoke palaeographical probabilities, because the zealous cook never thought of them. So I propose to read πλέων for πέμπει; when δέ was added after ἐθέλει, the participle had to be changed to an indicative. For the scansion cf. frag. i. 13, ἀποπλέων, *Odyssey* a 183, and Timocreon i. 8.

For the simile of the eagle and the little birds, which follows, compare *Titus Andronicus* IV. iv. 83:

The eagle suffers little birds to sing,
And is not careful what they mean
thereby,
Knowing that with the shadow of his wing
He can at pleasure stint their melody.

Bacchylides as an eagle would remind me of that ode of Cibber's, which amused Dr. Johnson so much, wherein he speaks of a linnet soaring on an eagle's wing. But the truth is that the eagle is Hiero. The eagle rules earth, air, sea, and so I also have plenty of choice in praising Hiero, victor alike in games and war.

Compare also Aleman 28: δῶσαν δ' ἄπρακτα νεάνιδες, ὥστ' | ὄρνεις ἱέρακος ὑπερπταμένω.

26, 27. Delete the comma after χάει and read νομᾶ to govern ἔθειραν. But νομᾶται is quoted by the scholiast to Hesiod; however even if we keep νομᾶται it must govern ἔθειραν.

28. Obviously πνοαῖσιν.

48. ἔται involves at least something very

¹ [See also notes by Thomas, Headlam, and Sandys.]

² [See also note by Headlam.]

³ [See also note by Thomas.]

like a false quantity. The line then began *ἱερ'*. But what is *νεόκροτον*? The best I can think of is *ἱερ' αἰνησίμβροτον*, which, being perhaps written *-σιβροτον*, had to be corrected somehow when *ἱεται* was wrongly divided. From *νησιβροτον* to *νεόκροτον* is still a long way, but what would a copyist make of *νησιβροτον*? He would correct it *semehow*. Or has *αἰνεσίκροτον* any sense?

60. *κύν' ἄξοντ'* is straight from *Odyssey* xi. 623, elisions and all.

64. *ἑδάη* is strange. *εἶδεν*? *ΕΙΔΕ* and *ΕΔΑΕ* are very near.

107. *πλημύρων*. (So also Housman and Nairn).

110. *εἰσάνταν*, (for *εἰσάντην*, cf. *εἶσαντα* and *ἀντην*).¹

121. [*τοὺς δ' ὦ*] *λεσε μοῖρ' ὀλόα*.

[*τλάμονα*]; οὐ γάρ πω δαίφρων.

τλάμονας has of course no claim to scansion. Meleager has spoken of burying those slain by the boar, and then goes on: 'others did dire fate slay, for Artemis was not yet content.' What then must be supplied? Something like 'a different' fate. Hence I conjecture that some word such as *δοῦρός* is missing, but cannot find one of more than six letters.

Then, does a poet worth his salt say *ὠλεσε ὀλόα*? Something like *τοῖς δ' ἔμπεσε* would be more natural. Is the *λ* certain in *ὠλεσε*?

160. *τόδ' ἔφα*. Another impossible piece of scansion. *τοῖδ'* first hand. Did Bacchylides say *τεῖδ'*? If not, at least we must read *ᾤδ'*, or *τᾶδ'* or some long syllable. This among other things looks as if the third hand was sometimes emending on his own account, and a pretty bad metrist he must have been.

175. This abrupt ending of the myth at such a place is positively comic, unless there was some point in the marriage arrangement here described, a reference to some wedding at Hiero's court at the time. Suspicion becomes certainty when we look at *Olymp.* i. 69-89, written for the same occasion.

189. *ἀπωσαμέναν* or more likely *ἀπωσαμένους*. The *τις* in 190 is responsible for the change to the singular. But the short syllable, is not, I think, quite impossible.

196. *γλώσσαν ὀϊωνὸν καλᾶς*. An adjective is wanted with *κελεύθου*.

197. Translate, 'for thence spring noble scions, whom may Zeus preserve!' and read [*φυλάσσοι*] for [*φυλάσσει*].

¹ [See also notes by Headlam, Richards, and Sandys.]

viii. 6. οὗτις ἀνθρώπων κ[λεεν]-
νὰς ἐν ἄλικι χρόνῳ
παῖς ἑὼν ἀνὴρ τε π[
νας ἐδέξατο νίκας.

In line 8 *ποσσὶ πλεῖνας* is already conjectured by Dr. Sandys, and is excellent so far as it goes, but it leaves the extraordinary phrase *ἐδέξατο νίκας* untouched. Read:

παῖς ἑὼν ἀνὴρ τε ποσσὶ στεφάνους
πλεῖνας ἐδέξατο νίκας,

which gives a much better rhythm and the required sense. Hence if *κλεινὰς* be the right word at 6 we must accent *κλεινὰς*. Then at 12 read *περὶ κῆρτα τιθεῖς*, or *τιθείς οἱ*, or *τε θές*, or in short something with some semblance of verse about it. And at 13:

γλαυκὸν Αἰτωλίδος
ἄνδρ' ἐλαίας,

the ear yearns for a choriambus after *Αἰτωλίδος*; e.g.

γλαυκὸν Αἰτωλίδος ὑψικλάδοι ἄνδρ' ἐλαίας

would make a decent verse.

ix. 10. *φοινικάσπιδες*.² Yet the army of the Seven was notoriously *λευκάσπιδες*—well, even *καὶ λευκάσπιδες* would be better than γὰρ νικ. Nonnus (xxv. 387) calls the shield of Dionysus *πολύχρους*, but that is a wonderfully wrought shield like the shield of Achilles. This also was partly coloured red according to Quintus Smyrnaeus v. 27, *πέδον ἅπαν αἵματι πολλῷ δευομένῳ ἦκτο κατ' ἀσπίδος*. And of course there is the *παρήιον ἵππων* of *Iliad* Δ 141 which a woman *φοίνικι μαίνει*; this shows that in Epic times some parts, at any rate, of armour might be red.

14. σᾶμα μέλλοντος φόνου.
ὦ Μοῖρα πολυκρατές· οὐ νιν
παῖθ' Ὀϊκλείδας πάλιν
στείχειν.

Put a comma after *φόνου*, another after *πολυκρατές*, and read *οὐ*, despite the accent in the MS. which was not put there by the poet. 'Where Amphiaras strove to turn them back, but hope deceived them.'

19. *Ταλαϊονίδα* for the sake of scarified ears! and at 45 *πολυζήλωσε ἀναξ*.

86. *κάλλιστον* [*ἔχρος καὶ θανοῦσιν*]. Cf. xiii. 30, 171. I can find no word to suit beginning with *ει*.

² [See also note by Sandys.]

88. Corrupt as well as mutilated, as the scansion shows.

x. 6. χρῦ[σο... But the first syllable is short; read χρῦ[σε... χρῦσος is almost unknown.

10. Possibly Πασία, τὴν δ' ἐκείνησεν.¹ Cf. *Olymp.* vi. 12. There is some evidence that τιν may be long, and if so the δ' is not wanted.

12. εἴη? But I should prefer ἀνθρώποισι θεΐη; or the epic θεΐη is nearer the MS.

15. δσσά<κισ>? Cf. 27, etc.

25. τετράκωλον unluckily will not scan. If the first syllable be long it makes a logaoedic verse, if it be short there is no getting it to correspond to the similar line in the second epode. The only words apparently that will fill up are τετραέλικτον and τετραέτηρον, if anything can be made of either of them. Or the line may have begun with τετράκι. Of course it is possible that Bacchylides wrote τεσσαράκωλον (cf. τεσσαράβοιος) and that it was written τετράκωλον by some one contemptuous of metre. But Mr. Kenyon's principle is a good one, not to emend in a mutilated passage, if it can possibly be helped.

28. εἰβού- | λων [Χαρίτ]ων προφάται.

But this is a logaoedic verse and the ode is Dorian. Moreover εἰβούλων does not mean 'favouring,' and is no proper epithet of the Graces. Therefore χαρίτων must be wrong, but it is not so easy to see what is right. The best I can think of is εἰβούλων ἀεθλάρχων προφάται; Mr. Kenyon marks a lacuna of six letters, and seven is as near to six as five is; I am in no way proud of ἀεθλάρχων, but ἀγωνάρχων seems forbidden by euphony, βραβευτάων is too long and a dubious word besides for poetry, and in short ἀεθλάρχων is the best I can devise.

x. i. Perhaps

φήμα, σὺ γὰρ ἄμβροτος ἀνθρώπων πεδοιχνεῖς ἄθλα.²

47. Stop after ἐσθλῶν, instead of after κάλλιστον. But still ἐσθλῶν is bad: the MS. has ΕΞΕΛΩΝ, read ἀέθλων and compare *Pyth.* i. 99. Also read μὰν or μὴν for μέν.

51. Mr. Adam proposes γλώσσαν ἰθύσας, which appears to have been the reading of the first hand.

53. λαμπ]ρόν εὐφροσύνα. Or possibly ἄστρον.

xi. 1. Νίκα γλυκίδωρε, διδοῖ γὰρ σοὶ πατήρ

¹ [See also note by Pearson.]

² [See also note by Headlam.]

τιμὰν ἀγώνων, or something of the sort, and put a comma after verse 7.

30. Reading κ' ἐπὶ (Housman) at 24, supply here πορτιτρόφ[ον Ἰταλίαν νικῶνθ'].

43. ἐφόβησεν.

47. ἔτι is no sense unless it can be shown that maidens might not enter the temple; even then ἐπὶ would be far better.

77. It was Professor Housman who pointed out to me that the last syllable must be long; read κάμουν' ἐλθόντες.

87. δοίαζε?

106. ἀριστοπάτρα.

110. Read τὰι for γὰ.³

119. The metre proves plainly that we must read πρὸ γουνοῖ for πρόγονοι. Hence the whole theory about the ancestors of Bacchylides must vanish again into the thin air from which it sprang. Cf. iii. 19.

xiii. 29. Read παύροις βορῶν αἰεί. If there be not room for αἰ- before -εί, it is easy to suppose that the word was written αἰέ.

48. ἐν πάντεσσιν [ἐπεὶ τοι].

50. Remove the stop after φαίνων.

53. ταρφέω[s].

xiii. 77.

ὁππότε Π[ηλείδας] . . α . . . τα . . .
ὠρεΐνατ[ο Δαρδανιδᾶν] τ' ἔλυσεν ἀλκάν].
οἱ πρὶν μὲν . . .

Δαρδανιδᾶν and ἀλκὰν Jebb, who also suggests (after Πηλείδας) ἐπαύετ' αἰχμαῶν, ὁ δ' οἶος, thus making the subject change from Achilles to Ajax. I think Achilles is subject all through. Also the first syllable of the word following Πηλείδας ought to be long; the only other short syllable in this place in the ode is in another suggestion by the same critic which happens also to be ridiculous poetry (123); Mr. Kenyon knows better and marks the first syllable long. Though a short is theoretically permissible in this place it is something of a poetic license, and Bacchylides has carefully put a long one in all the eight lines where his text is preserved. Then ὠρεΐνατο is odd enough anyway, but if Ajax is the subject it makes it odder still. Achilles sulked but Ajax ὠρεΐνατο! Again, what is Δαρδανιδᾶν ἔλυσεν ἀλκάν? Ajax did nothing of the sort; he covered a retreat, he defended a ship; would you say that Ney ἔλυσεν ἀλκάν of the Russians in 1812? Why, Ajax could not keep the enemy from firing the ships, and even allowing for the exaggeration of an ode, ἔλυσεν ἀλκάν is still too strong.

Fill up then rather with something like: ἡγνάτ' ἀλκὰν καὶ χόλῳ κῆρ | ὠρεΐνατο, Δαρδανιδᾶν τ' ἔλυσεν ἄλγος or ἄταν. Achilles

³ [See also note by Pearson.]

refused to fight, because he was stirred at heart by wrath, and so he stayed the woe of the Trojans. Neither ἄλγος nor ἄταν seems right, but no better word beginning with ἄ can I think of at present. ὠρεῖναι is truly extraordinary and perhaps we should read ὀργαίνο¹ (Bacchylides wrote OPT and probably did not mean it to be augmented, but if you prefer ὠρ because somebody who knew no more about it than we do once transliterated it as ὠρ, why there is no harm done). I prefer ἡνάντο to ἀνάντο for the reason given on page xlvi. of Mr. Kenyon's introduction, but of course it is fifty to one that ἀναίνομαι was not the verb used at all.

Professor Housman improves further the Δαρδανίδας τ' ἔλυσεν ἄτας, or whatever the genitive may have been.

81. Evidently the lacuna had a negative in it, e.g. [φόβω οὐ τι].

84. [πτ]ᾶσσαν.² If there is not room for [πτ] read [δ' ἐπ] at end of 83, and -τασσαν in 84. But this would involve ἡρω' at 71 and would make ν[ᾶσσαν] doubtful at 149.

85. I think ἐν πεδίῳ right; it seems better sense and the poet nowhere else uses ἐν for ἐς. And cf. *Isth.* vii. 54.

91. For the simile compare *Paradise Lost* ii. 286:—

The sound of blustering winds which all
night long
Had roused the sea, now with hoarse cadence
lull,
Seafaring men o'erwatched, whose bark by
chance
Or pinnace anchors in a craggy bay
After the tempest.

You would have sworn Milton was copying
Bacchylides.

95. λῆξεν δὲ σὺν φασσμ[βρότῳ]
'Αοὶ στόρεσεν δὲ τε πό[ντον]
οὐρία, νότον δ' ἐκόν[τος] —
ιστίον, ἀρπαλέως ἄ-
ελπτον ἐξ[έκο]ντο χ[έρσον].

So Kenyon, admitting that νότον ἐκόντος is unparalleled, but arguing that νότον must have some sort of construction. Look at the opposite page and you will see that οὐρία is the corrected MS. reading, not οὐρία. What if νότον depends on that? Again ἀρπαλέωσα first hand, σ is written over τ; does not this mean that we are to read ἀρπαλέως τ' ἀελπτον? Then στόρεσεν πόντον οὐρία strikes

¹ With γυναικός, for example, instead of χόλε κῆρ in the previous line.

² [See also notes by Sandys and Thomas.]

me as not quite the natural thing. Rude Boreas ceases at dawn and *by ceasing* lulls the sea; every one remembers δεινῶν τ' ἄημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε στένοντα πόντον and fifty other things of the kind. Then ἐκόντος being so doubtful, is there no other possibility? Yes, ἐκόντες, the sailors *willingly* hoist their sails to the south wind, after being *unwillingly* driven by the storm.³ The word following ἐκόντες probably began with a consonant, because to shorten the last syllable of two epitrites running is a sad confession of weakness. Considering all these things, I propose:—

πόντον,
οὐρία νότον δ' ἐκόντες κοῖφισαν (or some better
word)
ιστίον, ἀρπαλέως τ' ἀελπτον ἐξέκοντο χέρσον.

The objections are (1) οὐρία νότον, which I cannot precisely parallel, but if Pindar says οὔρος ἐτέον and so on, why not οὐρία νότον too? (2) The accent on οὐ. in the papyrus. This can only point to οὐρία, but there seems no making anything of that, and the accent is perhaps only a mistake for a breathing. (3) The position of δ', which I do not remember elsewhere as third word in Bacchylides, who is very orthodox in the position of his words, except at x. 45. But like it or not it seems clearly what the MS. points to.

100. ἐπεὶ κλύον, with θεοῖσιν in 105.⁴

117. πάροι.

122. Did ever any poet out of Bedlam talk of ἡμίθεοι in one line and ισόθεοι in the next? I think the second line may have run αἶξαν ἴσοι θεῶν δι' ὁρμάν, but even the MS. reading is uncertain. Or αἶξαν ἴσος, with ὅς τότε γ' in 121.

124. ῃ.

125, etc. Something like:

[θάλλ]οντες ὑπερφίλιον
φρόνημ' ἐθρεψαν]
[Τρῶε]ς ἱππενταὶ κνανώπιδας ἐκ
[πάτρας ἀποσσεσθαι] νέας
[νυκτὸς δ' ἔπνον εἰλα]πίνας τ' ἐν
[ἀμέ]ρ[α]ς ἐξεν θ[εο]δ[ύ]ματον πόλιν.

(Τρῶες Kenyon, εἰλαπίνας Kenyon, ἀμέραις Blass, θεοδύματον Blass.) Bad enough lines in all conscience, but they will scan and that is something to be thankful for.

145. An adjective is wanted to agree with δόξα. Read then ἀ[αμάτῳ] or better ἀ[αμάτῳ].

³ τοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐθέλοντας κελλαι πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθύοντα φίλων ἀπάνευθε φέρουσιν. *Iliad* T 377.

⁴ [See also note by Sandys.]

160. Mr. Adam proposes to read $\rho\omega\tilde{\alpha}$ if there be not room for Mr. Nairn's $\theta\alpha\mu\tilde{\alpha}$ δῆ.

193. Something like [ἐχαρίσσατ' ἐμὰν].

194. ἐπαθρήσας τ[έχνας].¹

195. εἰ κ' ἐνέσταξεν, καρύξοντι is the most remarkable Greek I have seen since looking over the London B.A. pass papers. εἰ γ' is obvious and exactly suits the sense, but Professor Gildersleeve says εἰ γε is not lyrical. εἴθ' seems out of the question.

xiv. 1. δαί[μονος].²

3. ἐσθλῶν.

5. [θυμὸν, καὶ [ἀμ'] ὑψιφανῇ τεύ-
[χει κ]ατορθωθείσα.

12, 13, 15. [οὐτ' ἄ]ν—ἀρμό[ζοι]—|οὐτ'
ἄ]ν.

17. Should not the line end at ἔργματι, the first syllable of κάλλιστος being the anacrusis of the next?

xv. 13. σύν<τε>θεοῖς or something of the sort.

61. Read σφ' ἐς.

xvi. 13. One would certainly expect κλύο-
μεν, rather than κλέομεν.

20. μέλλεν?

29. προτὶ to judge from the space left in the uncial text. λιπαρὰν for λιπαρόν is demanded by euphony and sense; cf. v. 169.

xvii. It is not at all clear how much license Bacchylides allowed himself in Paeanian verse. Certainly a great deal more than Pindar did, unless the text is very corrupt. But he was as much inferior to Pindar in the management of verse as he is in most other things, as is shown very clearly in his Dorian rhythms. However I will propose tentatively that at 37, to cure two metrical faults, we should read ἰόπλοκοι κά | λυμμ' — ὤ Νηρηίδες. Of course εἶμα would drop out easily but it is barely sense, and anything else may have gone. At 62 σὺ would drop out more easily than τὸ and is perhaps more poetical, but also perhaps nothing need be inserted. At 102 if exact parallelism be needed we may read ἔδεω' ἁλβίου Νηρέος. At 109 σεμνὰν τε πατρός... ἔδε βοῶπιν. In 91 the last syllable of ἀήτα (ἄητα) must be short; compare Simonides 41 where the word occurs again and the rhythm shows pretty clearly that it is short. At 92 the third syllable of Ἀθαναίων is short. In 42 it is easy to read ἀμβρότον; in 20 read φερτάτοι' with the opposite change. At 112 αἰὼνα will scan well enough. At 50 read probably Ἀελών, and in the corresponding line 116 δολόεσσ' for δόλιος

(δόλις first hand in the papyrus and the second hand is worthless or nearly so). The feminine δόλιος is suspicious, though Euripides uses it as he will do with any adjective, such was his misogyny. Finally, if the eighth and ninth lines of the epode go together, as seems not improbable, read τέκ[εν] at 54 for τέκ[ε] and Κνωσίων at 120 for Κνώσιον.

37. Mr. Kenyon has forgotten the loveliest line in Alcaeus:

ἰόπλοκ' ἄγνα μελλιχόμευδε Σάπφοι.

39. τῷ should not be changed to τῷ.

49. ἀδρόν?

58. καὶ σέ.

74. Θησεί, τάδ' ἐμὰ? What does δῶρα mean?

90. I propose with great doubt:

ἔτεο δ' ὠκόπομπον δορυσσόος (-ύας, -ύα)
νιν Βορέας κ.τ.λ. (νιν Housman).

If δορυσσόος means 'driving a spear' and δόρν means also 'a ship,' it follows that δορυσσόος may mean 'driving a ship.' And for the middle ἔτεο, 'sent before it,' compare Homer's ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο.

The stop after δόρν in the MS. is very abrupt, and can hardly be right.

118. φρενοάρας. For the form cf. Pindar's χαλκοάραν Μέμνονα (*Isth.* iv. 45) and χαλκο-
αράν (*Isth.* iii. 81).

xviii. 9. What are μήλων ἀγέλας? μήλα σεῖδόν τ'! but the tense is bad.

33. πολεμῆοισιν | ὅπλοισι?

39. τοσούτων seems better.

41. ἡ—μήσεται; Medea's bad conscience is working. 'Or can it be that he is a divine messenger of vengeance?'

43, 41. The meaning is: 'It is not easy for one who is always doing evil to escape evil.'

46. ἀμαρτεῖν is the regular form in old poetry.

50. By some bold transposition one might get rid of the difficulties:

κῆρυκτον κυνέαν κάρα
Λάκαιαν περὶ πυρσόχαϊτον,
στέρνοις τε πορφύρεον χιτῶν' ἄμφι.

But one must then assume the passage to have been altered on imaginary metrical grounds. If πυρσοχαῖτον came from πυρσο-
χαίτας (see Index) it would be πυρσοχαῖτα.

xix. 5. ἰοβλέφαροί τέ εἰ καί. If not, at least correct the antistrophe to εἰντ'.

21. κέλευσε.

¹ [See also note by Thomas.]

² [See also note by Headlam.]

seems to lurk in Catullus' verse lxi. 395 *aut rapidi Tritonis hera aut Rhamnusia uirgo*; for Athena and Nika would naturally be combined as *encouraging* an army, whereas Nemesis would appear rather to give a warning.

ix. 17. ἀσαγέοντα is perhaps a mistake for ἀλατεύοντα 'roaming,' as the child Opheltēs (Archemorus) is described by Statius *Theb.* iv. 792 *nemorique malorum Inscius et uitae multum securus inerrat*. Lactantius on *Theb.* iv. 779 *Archemorum Lycurgi filium quem draco interemit* is almost a translation of Bacchylides' words τὸν ξανθοδερκῆς | πέφυ' ἀλατεύοντα δράκων.

30. Perhaps ἀμύμονα.

37. Possibly

τοῖψ [ποτ' ἀλκί] μψ [σθένε] ι
γνια [λκία λή] ματα [πρὸς] γαίᾳ πελάσσω [ν]
ικετ' [Εὐξείνου] παρὰ πορφυροδίναν.

Eur. *H. F.* 410 in his catalogue of Herakles' exploits mentions his crossing the *Euxine* to war with the Amazons about Maeotis, τὸν ἱππευτῶν τ' Ἀμαζόνων στρατὸν | Μαίωτιν ἀμφὶ πολυπόταμον | ἔβα δι' Εὐξείνου οἶδμα λίμνας. Possibly the rivers of Ares (45) are these Scythian rivers about the Maeotis, perhaps including the Ister: for the Amazons reached the Ister, and Thrace, as we learn from Herodotus v. 13, was colonized by Teucrians from *Troy* (ὑψιπέλου Τροίας ἔδος), cf. Grote iii. p. 283 ed. 1.

Thrace, and generally, the northern regions of ice and snow, were the special seat of Ares. Hence, in the *Iliad* (xiii. 301) Ares and Phobos start from Thrace, τὼ μὲν ἄρ' ἐκ Θρήκης Ἐφύρουσ μέτα θυρήσσεσθον; hence Virgil calls Thrace *Mauortia* G. iv. 461; cp. Servius there *idcirco Thracia Mauortia tellus dicitur quia in divisione terrae Marti cessit*. Hence Statius *Theb.* vii. init. summons Mars from thence (5-10, 34-38, 64 sqq.): the rivers of the North might therefore fairly be called *rivers of Ares*.

ix. 55. I suggest [τίς δ' οὐ δολιχέρει] μων Αἴγυναν; Pind. *O.* viii. 20 ἐξέτερε κρατέων πάλαι δολιχέρει μων Αἴγυναν πάτραν.

x. 51. Possibly τί μακρὰν [γλῶ] [σσ]αν ἰθύνας ἐλαύνω | ἐκτὸς ὁδοῦ; unless ἰθύσας of the papyrus is used transitively. The language is comparable with Pindar *Nem.* vii. 70, 71 ἀπομύνω | μὴ τέρμα προβάς ἀκονθ' ὥτε χαλκοπάραον ὄρσαι | θοὰν γλῶσσαν.

xi. 102, 3. With this compare the Greek epigram in Vitruvius viii. 3, 25, and my article in *Cambridge J. of Philology*, vol. vi. p. 273. The writer of the epigram uses the very word of Bacchylides to describe the madness of the Proetides, λύσσα

NO. CII. VOL. XII.

xiv. i. παρὰ δαίμονος seems more likely than παρὰ δαίμοσιν.

3 sqq. Perhaps

συμφορὰ δ' ἐσθλῶν ἀμαλδύ-
νει βαρύτλατος μολοῦσα
[πλοῦτ]ον καὶ [ἐς] ὑψιφανῇ τε-
[λεῖ κ]ατορθωθείσα· τιμάν
δ' ἄλλος ἀλλοίαν ἔχει.
[μυρί]αι δ' ἀνδρῶν ἀρε[ταί], μιά δ' ἐ[ς]
[τιμὰ]ν πρόκειται.
[ὅς γε] πᾶρ χειρὸς κυβερνᾶ-
ται δικαίαισιν φρένεσσιν.
[οὔτοι] βαρυνθέντες ἀρμό-
ζει μάχαις φόρμιγγος ὁμφά
[οὐ λι]γυκλαγγεῖς χοροί.

xvii. 4. Το Κρητικὸν τάνειν πέλαγος corresponds in the antistrophe Αἴσαν ἐκπλήσσομεν ὅταν. Kenyon edits τάνειν; but it is not impossible that τάνειν is right, and ἐκπλήσσομεν should be changed to ἐκπλήσωμεν. I am aware that in the *second* strophe and antistrophe, παιδὶ πανδερκέα θέμεν and ἡθέων γένος ἐπεὶ, the former of the two corresponding verses has a short syllable in this place, and the latter, *seemingly*; for, as a whole, the metre only corresponds imperfectly. But in view of the many cases in this ode where the correspondence of metre is not consistently carried out, if the papyrus is right, it seems worth while to suggest the above possibility.

10. I should prefer Κύπριδο[ς ἐσθλ]ὰ δῶρα.

37. I do not believe any alteration is safe here, though a syllable is wanting at the end to make the metre correspond. At any rate it cannot be τοι. A syllable is wanting in the same place xviii. 35.

62. δικὼν θράσει [σὺ] σῶμα is an easy correction.

67. ἀμειτρον of the papyrus is perhaps ἄμτρον, a Cretan word = μικρόν (Hesych.). The prayer was *short* and is therefore not expressed by the poet.

74. I doubt whether the inserted σὺ is right: it spoils the effect of the following σὺ δ' ὄρνυ.

80. ἡνδεδρόν must have some special reference: but it is not easy to see what.

91. May not νειν be νιν, as perhaps in xi. 15, σόει an imperfect connected with σένειν, ἱπποσώας δοννο-σώας, etc. and meaning 'urged on' ?¹ The lengthening of the ν in δόρνυ, if exact correspondence of metre is thought indispensable, might perhaps be accounted for from the commonness with which short vowels preceding -σώας, -σώης, etc. cause the following σ to be doubled.

¹ [See also notes by Pearson and Richards.]

112. For the corrupt αἶονα of the papyrus δῶαν is a possible suggestion. It would mean, I suppose, a purple hem, i.e. a robe with a purple border.

xviii. 27. Πολυπήμονός τε καρτερὰν | σφῆραν ἐξέβαλεν Προκό | πτας, ἀρείονος τυχὼν | φωτός. These vv. are natural and intelligible if Prokoptes, which seems a mere variation on Procrustes, is supposed to be the son of Polypemon. Such he is apparently in Ov. *Ib.* 407 *ut Sinis et Sciron et cum Polypemone natus*; for with Sinis Sciron Polypemon Cercyon (*Ib.* 412) it was almost inevitable to add Procrustes as in *Met.* vii. 436 *sqq.*, *Her.* ii. 69, 70.¹

The Ibis scholia, it may be noted, are, so far as I know, the only authority extant till the discovery of Bacchylides for the story, given at length in Bacchylid. *fr.* i. (p. 105 Kenyon), of the rape, committed by Minos on Dexithea and the birth of Euxanthius in consequence. The scholion is thus given in MS. Phillips 1726, one of the best which I employed for my edition (Oxford, 1881). I cite the part only which contains the legend. *Ad quas* (Macelo and her sisters) *cum uenisset Minos cum Dexione concubuit: ex qua creauit Euxantium unde Euxantidae fuerunt.* This is identical with the scholion published by Saluagnius, and in the ed. Paris. of 1573, except that these for *ad quas* have *ad alias uero seruatas, Desithone or Desitone for Dexione, and Eusantium Eusantiae for Cuxantium, Cusantie of P.* It is impossible to say whence this scholion was drawn: but it is now an ascertained fact, which the new papyrus puts beyond doubt, that it could not have been from Apollod. iii. 1, 28 or the scholion on Ap. Rhod. i. 186.

ROBINSON ELLIS.

p. 9 i. 38: Callim. *Ep.* 33, 5 (*A.P.* xii. 102), Hor. *Sat.* i. 2. 138, Ov. *Am.* ii. 9. 9.

i. 42 (=19) is unmetrical, but the words admit of transposition: ὅσσον ἂν ζῶν, λάχε τόνδε χρόνον τίμαν.²

p. 21 iii. 38, 39: Aesch. *Cho.* 899, Eur. *Tro.* 430.

p. 23 iii. 49 ξύλινον δόμον 'structure': Hom. *M.* 169, 301, Aesch. *Supp.* 141, Eur. *Alc.* 165.

p. 25 iii. 63 οὐτις...θελήσει

65 <αἰχέι>ν σέο πλείονα χρυσὸν
>α πέμψαι βροτῶ.

67 <εὐλο>γεῖν πάρεστιν, ὅς-
τις μὴ φθόνῳ παίνεται.

¹ [See also note by Housman.]

² [See also note by Housman.]

v. 66 = 'to a poet'! v. 67 or εὖ λέγειν v. 67: cf. v. 188, xiii. 166. v. 68: Pind. *P.* ii. 55.

p. 29 iii. 90: I cannot credit μυνθεῖ. To my mind μυνίθη is most probable both here and in v. 151 μυνίθη δέ μοι ψυχὰ γλυκεῖα (cf. Theognis 361, Aesch. *Theb.* 903).

v. 22: Alcaeus 27, Soph. *Aj.* 171, Alcman 28.

p. 47 v. 80 γελανώσας = γαληνώσας, as γελανής = γαληνής.³

p. 51. The division (remarked by Mr. Kenyon) of the words Καλυδῶν' and ὑμνοῖαντο|σ' is normal: see Bast *Greg. Cor.* p. 859.

v. 110 read, as the accent indicates, ὅστις εἰσάνταν μῶλοι (= ἄντην, ἔσαντα).⁴

v. 142. The conflict of emotions expressed in ἀγκλαύσασα (Prof. Jebb's correction of ἐγκλαύσασα) is amplified by Ov. *Met.* viii. 462-511.

p. 65 vii. 1 ὦ λιπαρὰ θύγατερ Χρόνου τε καὶ Νυκτός, i.e. 'Ἀμέρα, as Mr. Kenyon infers from Hes. *Theog.* 124. Cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 276 εὐάγγελος μὲν, ὥσπερ ἡ παροιμία, ἕως γένοιτο μητρός εὐφρόνης πάρα. 291 τῆς νῦν τεκούσης φῶς τόδ' εὐφρόνης. *Fr. adesp.* (Stob. *Ecl. Phys.* i. 2. 31) v. 8 Χρόνου παῖδων Ὠρᾶν, αἶ πάντα φέοντι. According to Eur. *fr.* 222, τὴν τοι Δίκην λέγουσι παῖδ' εἶναι χρόνου: but Νύξ could hardly be her mother.

vii. 7 <ᾶ>ρισταλκῆς

p. 71 ix. 6 μηλοδαῖκτᾶν: 'the other compounds are ψυχοδαῖκτῆν *A.P.* ix. 524. 24, ἀνδροδαῖκτων κοπάνων Aesch. *Cho.* 859, κόπον *fr.* 132, πυργοδαῖκτους πολέμους *Pers.* 106, λοντροδαῖκτος *Cho.* 1069, αὐτοδαῖκτοι *Theb.* 722. In *Anacreont.* 40. 10 φθόνον δαῖκτῆν (Pauw) is a necessary correction of δαυκτόν, as δαυκτῆρ Alcaeus 28, Aesch. *Theb.* 900, δαῖκτωρ *Supp.* 806.

ix. 10 <ἰθι γὰρ> νικᾶσπιδες ἡμίθει πρότιστον Ἀργείων κριτοῖ

does not convince me. The epithet I should expect is λευκάσπιδες—the heraldic symbol of the Argives, which is applied to the army against Thebes by Aesch. *Theb.* 89, Soph. *Ant.* 106, Eur. *Phoen.* 1106.

ix. 12: schol. Pind. *Nem.* p. 424-5 Boeckh.

ix. 13 ἀωτεῖοντα, Mr. Neil's conjecture, is established, in my judgment, by the variation in the story as told by Euripides and Statius. There were two interpretations of the word; that followed by Euripides (as by the critics now) was 'plucking flowers'; that followed by Statius was 'sleeping.' This I

³ [See *Classical Review*, Vol. xi. p. 452.]

⁴ [See also notes by Platt, Pearson, Richards and Sandys.]

xix. 9 *καὶνὸν* I prefer.
 xix. 15 *ἦεν Ἄργος δὲ* ? *ἦν ὅτε* is a common phrase: Pind. *fr.* 83 A. P. i. 92, viii. 178, xii. 44, xiv. 52, *ὅποτε* ix. 344, Naekē *Opusc.* i. 237.

xx. 1 Σπάρτα ποτ' ἐν <εὐρυχόρῳ>
 ξανθαὶ Λακεδα<μόνιαι>
 τοῖνδε μέλος κ<ατᾶρχον or κατᾶρξαν>
 ὅτ' ἄγετο καλλιπτα<χον ἐς δόμους>
 κόραν θρασυκάρ<ιδίος Ἰδας>
 6 Μάρπησσαν ἰο<στεφάνου>
 φυγὼν θανάτου <νέφος or τέλος>

v. 1: Pind. *N.* x. 52, Hom. v. 414, 1.—v. 2: ξανθαὶ is expressly indicated in the MS.—v. 3: Pind. *N.* iii. 10, Eur. *H.F.* 743, 881, *Hec.* 675, *Or.* 952.—v. 6, 7: cf. xiii. 30, 88, Theognis 707.

p. 199 *Fr.* 6. 1 <Π>ερίδες followed in v. 2 by some form (perhaps the imperative) of ὑφαίνειν or ἐνυφαίνειν: cf. v. 9, xix. 8, Pind. *fr.* 179.—v. 3 <γᾶρ> vs.

p. 201 *Fr.* 7. 5 <πο>λύαμπελ... Cf. vi. 5 ἄμπελοτρόφον Κέον.

Fr. 9 <ᾶρ>τις κέαρ?

Fr. 12. 1 . . . ε Χαιρόλαν

<μεμλημ>ένον Εὐσεβ<α>

cf. Pind. *fr.* 155. 3 Εἰθυμῖα μέλων. *O.* i. 89 ἀρεταῖσι μεμλότας.

Fr. 13. 9 αἰψηροῖς or <λ>αἰψηροῖς? But one would expect ἐν βένθεσσιν . . . ἄλός (Ar. *Ran.* 667 Blaydes).

Fr. 15. 2 <πάντ>εσσιν ἂν <θρώποις>

Fr. 17. 1 <ᾶργν>ροδίνα<ν> is possible.

Fr. 38. 2 <ἄκα>μάτῳ βορέ<α>: Emped. 426 ἀκαμάτων ἀνέμων σθένος.

Fr. 41 ὄλβιος δ' οὐδείς βροτῶν <τὸν ᾗ> πάντα χρόνον?

Fr. 45. 2: ἄγρυκτα κάλεκτα Pherecrat. Bekk. An. 339. 33.

Fr. 49 ἀπρακτα δυρόμενον? ἀπρακτα adverbially as Alcman 28.

Fr. 53: Hesych. Ἀγκύλη.

Fr. 72. 2 πρηντάτῳ is a right alteration, as A. P. vi. 349.

WALTER HEADLAM.

King's College, Cambridge,
 Dec. 14, 1897.

MOST of these conjectures have been printed without explanation in the *Athenaeum* for Dec. 25th 1897 and Jan. 15th 1898. Several of them, and in particular almost all the corrections of metre, were made independently and simultaneously by Professor Platt; and in these cases I add his name.

i 4-9. Supply as follows:

'Αργεῖος, ὃν οὐδὲ] λέοντος
 θῦνο[ς ἀδρῶ]ς ποτε
 <[>αχρεῖον ἂν θ]ολοῖ μάχας,
 ποσσιν τ' ἐλα]φρό[ς, π]ατρίων
 τ' οὐκ [ἀκλάρως κ]αλῶν,
 τόσα κτλ.

5

Verse 7 is so amended by Messrs Kenyon and Nairn, and the latter has seen that some case of *χαρεῖος* must be introduced in 6. *θῦνος* or *θυνός* is explained by Hesychius as *ὀρμή* and the verb *θύνω* is in Pindar. In 8 you may read *ἀπόκλαρως*, but *καλῶν* is necessary, and so is the comma: *τόσα* in 9 is relative. See ii 6 and v 51. The gen. plur. of *πάλα* is *παλῶν*, and will deprive *τόσα* of all meaning. Simonides frag. 8 praises Glaucus by saying οὐδὲ Πολυδεύκης βία χεῖρας ἀντέλιναι' ἂν ἐναντίον αὐτῷ.

At 2 *βαθυδειλο* (so the first hand) can hardly be anything but *βαθυχάϊον* or *βαθυχάσιον*: ΧΑΕΙ=ΛΔΕΙ=ΔΙΕΛΑ. Then Mr. Nairn's supplement (*C.R.* xi. p. 450) may be adopted with one slight change: πολ[ὺ] πρῶτος, τῷ[ν] βαθυχάϊον ξέσω]μεν γένος.

It is not I, but the MS., that presents a ditrochaean in lieu of an epitrite at 6. Bacchylides is quite content with this, and even with a trochee for a spondee in the dactylic cola. Antistrophe correspondence has nothing to do with the matter.

i 32. *νούσων* is unmetrical: write *νόσων* (so also Platt). Does the corruption seem strange? turn to v 78, 115, xi 28, xvi 11: in all these places a rarer form has wrongly supplanted a commoner. Equally unmetrical is frag. i 15, which belongs to this poem. If Mr. Kenyon's *Εὐρωπιδ[ος]* is right his [τῷ δ]εκάτῳ is wrong and τῷ must be ἐν. But since there is no reason to believe in the existence of a substantive *Εὐρωπῖς* I propose *Εὐρωπῖδα* (so also Platt), and further [σὶν δ]εκάτῳ: see xi 23. I take *Εὐρωπῖδα* to be not the feminine adjective but Aeolic for *Εὐρωπιδης*: see Bergk. at Pind. *Nem.* vi 60.

One does not like to look a gift horse in the mouth, and one cannot fairly expect a palaeographical expert to be a metrical expert as well: non omnia possumus omnes. But there must be quite half a dozen scholars in England who understand these matters, and it surprises me that Mr. Kenyon could get none of them to help him. The consequence is that his text contains at present a good many metrical solecisms: some of these are introduced by his own conjecture, and three or four supplementary violations of metre are proposed in

the notes by Professor Jebb. The schemes prefixed to the odes are often incorrect: the marks of quantity placed above lacunas are even worse, and have led Mr Nairn to make two unmetrical conjectures in the last number of this Review. Mr Kenyon says that ode iii is logaoedic: the strophe is, but the epode is dactylo-epitrite. He says that xi is logaoedic with dactylo-epitritic lines interspersed: it is purely dactylo-epitrite from beginning to end. He says that xiii is logaoedic: it is dactylo-epitrite with no logaoedic elements at all. He says that xvii is paeonian: it ought to be, but as Mr Kenyon prints it it is neither that metre nor any other. It is the more deplorable, because Mr Kenyon and Mr Palmer and Prof. Jebb have all three done a great deal to restore the text: some of Palmer's corrections in particular are admirable for their simplicity and certainty.

I wish to make an end of faultfinding, so let me say here that the discrepancies between the right and left-hand pages concerning the letters contained or omitted by the MS are numerous and sometimes grave.

i 34 ἴσον. Metre demands ἴσων.

i 42 χρόνον τόνδ' ἔλαχε.

Restore the metre by writing λάχε τόνδε χρόνον. For the transposition see xv 47.¹

ii 4, 5. Supply thus:

ὅτι μέγας θρασύχειρ <ἄρ'> Ἀργείος ἄρατο νίκαν.

For the use of ἄρα see Hom. X (xxii) 439 ἥγγελ' ὅτι ῥά οἱ πόσις ἐκτοθι μίμνε πιδάων, N 675, P 411, 655. Some will object to the sound of ἀραρ, but the Greeks did not mind it. The antistrophe simply means that Argius' victory at the Isthmus recalls the victories of other Cean there.

iii 21, 22 θεόν, θεόν τις | ἀγλαΐζω γάρ, ἄριστον ὄλβον. Write παρ' ἄριστον ὄλβον, 'in the hour of his prime prosperity'.² This is just what Croesus did, and had his reward in the day of trouble.

iii 25-27 εἴτε τὰν πεπ[ρωμέναν] Ζητὸς τελεῖ[οῦσαι κτί]σιν Σάρδιες Περσ[ῶν] ἐάλωσαν στρ[ατῶ]. Rather Σάρδιες Περσ[ῶν] ἐαν ἐπορθεῖντο στρ[ατῶ]. See xi 121 βουλαῖσι θεῶν μακάρων πέρσαν πόλιν and Herod. i 84 fin. οὕτω δὲ Σάρδιες τε ἠλώκεσαν καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἀστυ ἐπορθέετο. Pindar has the verb πορθεῖν at Nem. iv 26, and it is here better than ἐπερθοντο.

iii 48, 49. τὸς' εἴπε καὶ ἀβ[ρο]βάωταν κ[ε]λε[υ]σεν
ἄπτειν ξύλινον δόμον.

The ω is struck out. 'A soft stepper' is absurd enough, but to make Ἀβροβάωταν a proper name, 'told Jeames to light the fire', is too absurd. The ω was meant to alter this unbearable ἀβροβάωταν into the participle ἀβροβατῶν (it ought to be ἀβροβατέων); but Croesus began to ascend the pyre fourteen verses ago, and ought to have reached the top by this time. ἀβροβάτας would be better, but better still

* τὸθ' ἀβροβάωταν <ἐπέταν> κέλευσεν

'a soft-stepping attendant': the word is in Pind. Pyth. v 4. It was lost through homoeoteleuton, τὸθ' was mistaken for τὸς', and εἴπε καὶ inserted. τότε is thus used at 58 and xvi 23.

iii 62 ἐς ἀγαθέαν <ἐπ>έπεμψε Πυθώ. To write <ἀν>έπεμψε is just as easy and more appropriate.

iii 63 ὅσ[οι] μὲν Ἑλλάδ' ἔχουσιν is unmetrical, and I proposed to read θέμιν for μὲν, making Ἑλλάδ' an adjective. But ὅσ[οι] <γε> μὲν (so also Platt) is simpler and better. Croesus, with his golden river, gave richer gifts than any man in the world; in Greece however none has given more than Hiero.

iii 64 ὦ μεγαίνητε Ἴερον. The last syllable of μεγαίνητε, says Mr Kenyon, is lengthened in arsis. These things do not happen: I propose μέγ' <εὐ>αίνηθ'. Bacchylides sometimes rewards the monarch's munificence by investing him with a digamma, but compare for the elision iv 3.

iii 68 φθόνῳ λαίναται. So the first hand, rightly: see xvii 131 φρένα λαυθείς: the corrector who here wrote παινέται forgot to write παινθείς there. But what business has λαίνω with a digamma? As much as λῶς at v 75.

iii 87 εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός. Gold makes glad, but it is not gladness: write εὐφρόσυνος.

iii 90 μινύθει. The sense and tense are right, but the scansion must be — —. The same scansion, the same meaning, and a past tense, are required at v 151 where the MS gives μινύθθα. Here then we have two corrupted examples of the verb μινύθω or μινυνθῶ, already found in Hesychius μινυνθούσι δέ· φθείρουσι δέ· ἀφανίζονται δέ and μινυνθόσιν φθείρουσιν and μινυνθαδία, ἡ σελήνη ἀπὸ τοῦ μινυνθῆν. Write therefore at iii 90 μινύθει or μινυνθεί and at v 151 μινυνθεν or

¹ [See also note by Headlam.]

² [See also note by Richards.]

μύνθει : in the one place a more familiar verb has been substituted and in the other a more familiar adverb.

iii 96-98 σὺν δ' ἀλαθείᾳ καλῶν | καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν | Κηρίας ἀηδόνος. Mr Kenyon accentuates καλῶν and says it is the participle ; but the participle is καλέων : see v 152 ὀλιγοσθενέων, viii 2 ὑμνέων, xiii 85 κλονέων. At v 107, as Mr Nairn has observed, the true reading is πλημύρων, at xiii 190 we shall find that it is ὑμνων, at ix 32 ῥιπτῶν must be either ῥιπτῶν or ῥιπτέων. But here καλέων will demand an accusative which is not forthcoming, so I would rather transpose the consonants and write λακῶν. For the tense of the participle compare Pind. Isth. vi (v) 51 εἰπὲν τε φωνήσας.

v 11-15. Mr R. J. Walker in the Athenaeum for Dec. 18 has corrected the metre of this passage by writing πλεῖ in 12 and expelling δέ from 14. But the connexion is abrupt, κλεινός is insufferable beside κλεινάν, and the first hand has κλεινος. The corrector ought not to have inserted the ε but to have substituted it for the λ : write and punctuate

ξένος ὑμέτεράν
πλεῖ κλεινάν ἐς πόλιν.
χρυσάμπκος Οὐρανίας κεί-
νος θεράπων ἐθέλει
γάρυν κτλ.

v 48, 49 ἵεται νεόκροτον
νίκαν Ἰέρωνι φιλοξείνῳ τιτύσκων.

ἵεται is the wrong tense and νεόκροτον has no apparent meaning : both faults will be cured by the change of one letter, ἵετ' ἀφνεόκροτον, a victory abounding in noise. I suppose the element -κροτον will signify rather the clattering of hoofs than the clapping of hands : Homer A 160 and O 453 has ἵπποι κείν' ὄχρα κροτάλιζον and κροτέοντες to express the rattling of cars, and Mr Platt adds Pind. Pyth. v 92 ἵππόκροτον ὁδόν. ἀφνεός, not ἀφνεός, is the form Bacchylides employs.

v 104 εὐρυβίαν. Write εὐρυβία, for κούρα (after θεά) needs an epithet, and κάπρον has one to spare.

v 121, 122 [τοὺς δ' ὦ]λεσε μοῖρ' ὀλοὰ
[τλάμονα]s.

τλάμονας is the conjecture of Mr Kenyon, who calls it a cyclic dactyl. There are no such things as cyclic dactyls in this metre : write [τλαίνα]s.¹ Meleager lost one of his brothers at the hunting of the boar ; but others, more in number, perished in war.

¹ [See also note by Richards.]

πλέονας is also possible : see iii 83, viii 12, xiii 31.

v. 140-142.

καῖε τε δαιδαλέας
ἐκ λάρνακος ὠκύμορον
φιτρὸν ἐγκλαύσασα.

If Meleager meant to say that Althaea wept at burning the brand, he should have used -κλαίονσα and he should not have called her ἀτάρβακτος γυνή. The easiest change would be ἐγκλάσασα, but having regard to ἐκ λάρνακος I prefer ἐκκύσασα : as to the metre see what I said on i. 6.

v. 160. τὸδ' ἔφα is unmetrical. The first hand has ΤΟΙΔ, which is merely ΤΟΙΑ written without elision : read therefore τοῖ' ἔφα.

v. 182-184.

καὶ Πίσαν, ἔνθ' ὁ κλεινὸς
[πο]σσὶ νικάσας δρόμῳ
[αὐξ]εν Φερένικος εὐπύργους Συρακούσας.

The last line is unmetrical : write

[ἦλθ]εν Φερένικος <ἐς> εὐπύργους.

The adverb ἔνθα belongs only to νικάσας. ἦλθεν goes much better than αὐξεν with the following φέρων.

v. 189. ἀπωσάμενον. Metre requires ἀπωσαμένους (so also Platt) : see 69.

v. 191-194.

Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ τὰδε φών[ασεν παλαιός],
Ἥσιδος πρόπολος
Μουσῶν, ὃν ἀθάνατοι τι[μαῖς ὀφελλον]
καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἔπ[λησαν].

In 191 Mr Kenyon's restoration gives the right sense, but τὰδε is unmetrical : write τᾶδε, or else τάνδε φών[ασέν ποτ' ὀμφάν].

193 is also unmetrical. Repeat the syllable va and write

Μουσῶν, ὃ <ν ᾧ>ν ἀθάνατοι τι[μῶσι, τούτῳ]
καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἔπ[ισθαι].

This is the maxim referred to at 191.

vi 1-4.

Λάχων Διὸς μεγίστου
λάχε φέρτατον πόδεσσι
κῦδος ἐπ' Ἀλφειῷ προχοαῖς[ι σεμναῖς],
δι' ὅσσα κτλ.

δι' ὅσσα is senseless : write προχοαῖς [ἀέθλων] to furnish ὅσσα with an antecedent : the

genitive depends on the superlative *φέρτατον*. The meaning of the whole strophe is simply that Lachon has won the most glorious victory ever won at Olympia by a man of Ceos.

vii 9 ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισιν εὐδοξος κέκληται. What can ἐπὶ mean? Write either ἐν, or παρ' (αρ absorbed by αν), or πεδ' (Δ absorbed by Α): I prefer the last. See on xiii 142.

ix 1-6 should be written thus:

δόξαν, ὃ χρυσάλακατοι Χάριτες,
πεισίμβροτον δοίη¹ ἔπει,
Μουσᾶν τὸ ἰοβλεφάρων θεῖος προφάτας
εὐτυχος Φλοιοῖντά τε καὶ Νεμειάιον
Ζηγνὸς εὐθαλὲς πέδον
ὑμνείν.

I have amended the punctuation, written τό for τε in 3, and retained in 4 the εὐτυχος which Mr Kenyon alters to εὐτυκον. Μουσᾶν προφάτας is the poet, and cannot be anyone else. τό is relative with ἔπει for its antecedent, and is cognate accusative with ὑμνείν. εὐτυχος means ἐτοιμός and, like ἐτοιμός, takes an infinitive and dispenses with ἐστί: see Aesch. supp. 974 πᾶς τις ἐπειπεῖν ψόγον ἀλλοθρόοις εὐτυχος.

ix 10 κεῖ[θι γὰρ] νικᾶσπιδες ἡμίθεοι κτλ. This adjective is incapable of meaning anything: write [φοι]νικᾶσπιδες (so also Platt). Aeschylus Sophocles and Euripides give white shields to the Argives, but Pindar Pyth. viii 46 sends Alcmaeon to Thebes δράκοντα ποικίλον αἰθῶς ἐπ' ἀσπίδος νωμῶντα. ix 12-14.

ἀθλησαν ἐπ' Ἀρχεμόρῳ, τὸν ξανθοδερκῆς
πέφιν' ἀσαγεύοντα δράκων ὑπέρπολος,
σῶμα μέλλοντος φόνου.

Merely double the γ and write ἄσαγ γεύοντα. Opheltēs by his death gave the Argives a foretaste of woe, wherefore they named him Ἀρχεμόρος. I have corrected the accent of ξανθοδερκῆς.

ix 30-46¹ should be written and punctuated as follows:

τοῖος Ἑλλάνων δὲ ἀπείρονα κύκλον 30
φαῖνε θανραστὸν δέμας
δίσκον τροχοειδέα ρίπτων
καὶ μελαμφύλλον κλάδον
ἀκτίας ἐς αἰπυνὰν προπέμπων
αἰθέρ' ἐκ χειρὸς, βοᾶν τ' ὠρινε λαῶν 35
οἱ τελευταῖας ἀμάρνημα πάλας.
τοῖφ δ' ὑπερθύμῳ σθένει
γυιαλκία σώματα πρὸς γαῖα πελάσσας

¹ [Cf. note by Sandys.]

ἔκετ' [Ἀσωπὸν]ν πάρα πορφυροδίαν,
τοῦ κλέος πᾶσαν χθόνα 40
ἦλθεν καὶ ἐπ' ἔσχατα Νείλον·
ταί τ' ἐπ' εὐναεῖ πόρῳ
οἰκεῖσι Θερμῳδόντος ἐγγχείων
ἱστορες κοῦραι διωξίπποι Ἀρηος
σῶν, ὃ πολυζήλωτε ἀναξ, ποταμῶν 45
ἐγγόνου γένεσαντο καθ' ὑψιπύλον Τροίας ἔδος.

35 sq. βοᾶν τ' ὠρινε...οἱ scripsi, βοᾶν ὠτρυνε...η MS. The verb is ridiculous and a copula is indispensable. οἱ is circumflex because it begins the line and the anti-strophe. Perhaps however καί should be read: see what I say on xi 24.

37 τοῖφ δ' Platt, τοῖφδ' Kenyon: see 30.

39 Ἀσωπὸν scripsi. The subject of the sentence is of course Automedes. Whither did he go after his Nemean victory? Home to Phlius. On what river is Phlius built? Asopus. Who was the father of Thebe and Aegina (49-55)? Asopus again. Talk of chimaeras dire!²

40 τοῦ refers to Asopus.

45 πολυζήλωτε scripsi (so also Platt), πολυζήλωτ' MS unmetrically. ἀναξ here retains the digamma, as in Pindar.

46 ἐγγόνου scripsi, ἔγγονοι MS. καθ' Jebb, και MS. The Amazons, from the remote Thermodon, sampled the prowess of Asopus' descendant in the land of Troy. Since Achilles was not the grandson but the great-great-grandson of Asopus I should have expected ἐκγόνου.

ix 53-57³ may be supplied as follows:

τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν κvanoπλοκάμω
Θήβας ἐδματον πόλιν;
[τίς δ' οὐ χαριτών]μον Αἰγιναν; μέγιστον
[ἂ Διὸς πλαθεῖσα λέ]χει τέκεν ἥρω,
[καρτερὰν ἢ' Αἰακ]οῦ.

The mistake [χαρίτων ὦ]μον was very easy.

x 48 εἶμεν is good Doric, though perhaps too severe for Bacchylides.

x 50, 51.

τί μακρὰν . . ω . . αν ἰθύσας ἐλαύνω
ἐκτὸς ὁδοῦ;

The first missing letter may be γ, the ας of ἰθύσας is struck out and υ is written above the ι. The lost word is evidently γλώσσαν: then, since I do not see the appropriateness of ἰθύσας, I propose ἰθείας, which is very much like it. The word has puzzled the scribes again at xv 54, where the first hand

² [See also note by Richards.]

³ [Cf. note by Headlam.]

gives δικαληθείαν instead of δίκαν ιθείαν. εἰθείας is not found in Bacchylides. Compare Pind. Nem. i 25 εἰθείας ὁδοῖς, frag. 108 εἰθεία κέλευθος, Pyth. ii 85 sq. ὁδοῖς σκολιαῖς ... εὐθύγλωσσος, Ol. xiii 11 sq. τόλμα... εἰθεία γλώσσαν ὀρνύει λέγειν, though these resemblances are merely verbal.

xi. 8, 9 Ἐλλαθι [βαθυ]πλοκάμον κούρα [Διὸς ὀρ]θοδίκου. But βαθυπλοκάμον cannot belong to Διὸς: write [μετ' εὐ]πλοκάμον κούρα[s], i.e. μετ' Ἀρτέμιδος, who is often called εὐπλόκαμος. Νίκα and Ἀρτεμις are here invoked together because Bacchylides expressly says at 37-39 that Ἀρτεμις... νίκαν ἔδωκε. For μετ' perhaps πεδ'.

xi 11 [κελαδ]οῦσι. The 3rd pers. plur. of κελαδέω is κελαδεῦσι or κελαδέουσι: see 13 ἱμενέουσι, ix 43 οἰκεῦσι, vi 7 κρατεῦσαν, i 41 δονέουσι. Therefore something like Mr Nairn's [κατέχ]ουσι must be read.

xi 24-30 φάσω δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ λαθείους... δαπέδοις ... στεφανωσάμενον... ἰκέσθαι. The second hand restores metre by altering ἐπὶ to ἐν: better perhaps write δέ κ' ἐπὶ, for ἄν or κεν must somewhere be inserted. κ' may have been mistaken for an abbreviation of καί: I suspect that at ix 19 the corruption ΔΗ for ἄ καὶ arises from AK; and H at ix 36 may be K = καί.

xi 67, 68 λαοὺς τε διχοστασίας ἤρειπον (ἤριπον). That is not what their διχοστασίας did: write ἤρεικον (ἤρικον).

xi. 102-105 τέκνα δυστάνοιο λύσσης | πάρ-φρονος ἐξαγαγεῖν | θύσω δέ τοι εἴκοσι βοῦς | ἀζγυας φοινικότηρας. All these are the words of Proetus: ἐξαγαγεῖν is imperative.

xi 110 γαί δ' αὐτίκα οἱ τέμενος βωμόν τε τεύχον. Mr Kenyon writes γᾶ and proposes τᾶ, but clearly it must be ταί (so also Platt). xi 113-116.

ἐνθεν καὶ ἀρηϊφίλοις
ἄνδρεςσιν ἱπποτρόφον πόλιν Ἀχαιοῖς
ἔσπεο, σὺν δὲ τύχῃ
ναίεις Μεταπόντιον.

The metre of 114 must be

— — — — — x — — — —

Write therefore

ἄνδρες <σι πρὸ>ς ἱπποτρόφον ποίαν Ἀχαιοῖς

σιππο was absorbed by σιππο, which left ἄνδρεςσ' ἱπποτρόφον: I do not like to propose ἐν = ἐς. ΠΟΙΑΝ for ΠΟΙΛΙΝ is the confusion of Α with Λ and the consequent transposition of Ι, just as in Bergk's renowned Λιγναστάδι

for ἀγυῖς ταδί at Solon xx 3. See Soph. Ajax 143 ἱππομανῇ λειμῶνα and Eur. Andr. 1229 ἱπποβότων πεδίων, and the connexion of λειμῶν and ἱπποβότοιο in Hom. δ 605 sq. xi 118-120.

ἄλσος τέ τοι ἱμερόεν
Κάσαν παρ' εὐνδρον πρόγο-
νοι ἐσσύμενοι.

Impossible. The last syllable of 119 must be long: it is no good to read ἔσσαν ἐμοί and invent fairy-tales about Bacchylides' ancestors, who would have turned in their graves if he wrote verse like this. And if they emigrated to Metapontum, how came he to be born in Ceos? Mr Arthur Platt emends πρὸ γονοῖ, and I would complete the correction with ἔσσαν ἔμεν. Whether the precinct stood in front of a γονός I no more know than I know whether Bacchylides' ancestors made it; but there is all the difference between a picturesque detail and an impertinence, metre apart.

Since we learn from this passage that synaphea exists between the seventh and eighth lines of the epode, it follows that κάμον in 77 is unmetrical, so Mr Platt corrects κάμοντ': I had thought of writing φείλοντες or φέλσαντες in 78, but this is simpler. The comma in that sentence must be placed after κάλλιστον, not before.

xi 125 σὺν ἅπαντι χρόνῳ. More likely συνάπαντι: Pind. Ol. vi 56 χρόνῳ σύμπαντι.

xiii 25-30. Here Prof. Jebb's νίκας ἐρικυδέος (see 157) and αἰῶνι are evidently right, and his ἀγλαάν is probable; but his restoration as a whole I hardly understand, and it contains two false quantities. The following will be metrical:

[τᾶ δὴ παρ]ὰ βωμόν ἀριστάρχου Διὸς
[νίκας ἐρικ]υδέος ἄν-
[δεθεῖ]σιν ἄνθεα
[ἀγλα]ῶν δόξαν πολύφαντον ἐν αἰ-
[ῶνι] τρέφει παύροις βροτῶν
[αἰ]εῖ, καὶ ὅταν κτλ.

παύροις and αἰεῖ are Mr Platt's emendations. ἄνθεα is the subject of τρέφει.

xiii 61, 62.

παρθένου μέλπονσι τ.....ω
δέσποινα παιξε[.]

Supply and correct:

παρθένου μέλπονσι τ[ὸν γάμον], ὃ
δέσποινα παγξε[ῖνον χθονός].

or else τὸν γόνον: see the following context. Prof. Jebb's τὸν κλέος is too vague and will not fill the space.

xiii 67-70.

τῶν <θ'> νείας ἀερσιμάχ[ους]
ταχύν τ' Ἀχλλέα
εὐειδέος τ' Ἐριβοίας
παῖδ' ἐπέρθυμον βοα[θόν].

At 67 the insertion of θ', says Mr Kenyon, 'is necessitated by there being no verb following which can govern νείας.' The verb is in 70: βοά[σω]. See Eur. Hel. 1108 sq. σὲ τὰν ἐναυλείους ἐπὶ δενδροκόμοις | μουσεῖα καὶ θάκουσ ἐνίζουσιν ἀναβοάσω.

xiii 117 πάρ[α]. Metre demands παρ[αί]: see 150. So also Platt.

xii 142-144.

οὐ γὰρ ἀλαεπι νη[κτὸς]
πασιφανῆς ἀρετ[ῆ]
κρυφθεῖς ἄμανρο[ῦται σκότουςιν].

Write ἀλαμπῆ in 142 and καλύπτρα in 144: see xvi 32 δνοφερὸν κάλυμμα, Aesch. cho. 811 δνοφερῆς καλύπτρας. M was lost after ΛΑ here, as after ΑΔ at xix 48 καδὸς for Κάδμος, and πε was then reversed: so at vii 9 I suppose that Δ was lost before Α, and πε inverted in consequence.

xiii 149-153.

καὶ μὲν φερεκυδέα νῆσων
Διακοῦ τιμῶ. σὺν εὐ-
κλείᾳ δὲ φιλοστεφάνῳ
πόλιν κυβερνῶ
εὐνομία τε σάφρων.

150

This is the punctuation of the MS: the government of ἀρετά ceases in the middle of 150. If with Mr Kenyon and Prof. Jebb you put a comma there and alter the εὐνομία of 153 into εὐνομία the position of σάφρων becomes intolerable. Therefore the corruption resides in τε: write εὐνομία σασσίφρων, which is as good a word as σωσίπολις: Hesychius has σασσίμβροτος: ὁ σώζων ἀνθρώπους. τεΛΕόφρων would even more easily give rise to τεΑΛόφρων, but the meaning would be hardly so apt.

xiii 166-168.

εἰ μή τιν' ἀθερσ . . πῆς
φθόνος βιάται,
αἰνείτω σοφὸν ἄνδρα.

Write ἀμερσ[ε]πῆς: Hesychius has ἀμερσίφρων and Nonnus ἀμερσίνοος and ἀμερσίγαμος

and Pindar εὐρησιεπῆς. Let all praise Menander, save those whom envy has bereft of speech: 'some with envy dumb' says one of our own poets.

xiii 189-191. Supply as follows:

φονικοκραδέμνοι[ο Μούσας]
ὑμνων τινὰ, τάνδ' εἴ[καθεν νῆσσαν μολῶν],
φαίνω.

I said at iii 96 that ὑμνων and not ὑμνῶν must be read. Compare vi 10 ἀναξιμόλπου Οὐρανίας ὑμνος.

xiii 195-198.

τὰν εἴ κ' ἐτύμως ἄρα Κλει[ῶ]
πανθαλῆς ἐμαῖς ἐνέστα[ξεν φρεσίν],
τερψιεπείς νιν [δοι]δαί
παντὶ καρύξοντι λα[ῶ].

εἴ κ' ἐνέσταξε, καρύξοντι: such is the amazing solecism proffered by Messrs Jebb and Blass. I propose εἰ κλειτάν, and guess that ἐτύμως was written overhead to mark the paronomasia and then mistaken for a correction because ΚΛΕΙΤΑΝ looked like an unmetrical κ' αἰετάν. φρεσίν should probably be φρασίν. 193 sq. may be completed thus:

τὰν ἐμοὶ Λάμπων[πόμε, τηλόθεν οὐ]
βληχρὰν ἐπαθρήσας τ[έχραν].

The emendation of the last two words is Prof. Platt's. The insertion of οὐ seems necessary: Bacchylides may disparage himself (though he never does), but he must not disparage Clio.

xiv 3-6.

[σ]υμφορὰ δ' ἐσθλὸν ἀμαλδύ[
... β]αρύτλ[ατ]ος μολοῦσα.
...]ονηδηνησιφανητε[
... κ]ατορθωθείσα.

The third hand has struck out the ἡδ of 5 and written καί above it: after this καί there is a lacuna which Mr Kenyon supposes without reason to have contained a second word. ἐσθλόν in 3 is of course unmetrical. I propose

συμφορὰ δ' ἐσθλόν <κ'> ἀμαλδύ[
... β]αρύτλατος μολοῦσα
[θαητ]ὸν ἰδ' ὑψιφανῆ τε[ύ-]
[χοι κ]ατορθωθείσα.

Sore disaster, arriving with intent to crush him, would mend her ways and bring glory and exaltation to the man of worth. This

will be the only example of ἰδέ in all Bacchylides and Pindar. The only example in all Aeschylus Sophocles and Euripides is at Soph. Ant. 969 in a dactylic colon like this; and there it is corrupted to ἦδε as here to ἦδη. Simonides has ἦδε at frag. 53.

xiv 8-11

[μυρί]αι δ' ἀνδρῶν ἀρε[ταί]. μία δ' εἰ[δ-]
[δαίμω]ν πρόκειται,
[ὅς γε] πᾶρ χειρὸς κυβερνᾶ-
[ται δι]καίαισι φρένεσσιν.

In 10 the first hand has κυβερνᾶ, and πᾶρ χειρὸς does not seem to mean anything. Bacchylides is saying that the chief of virtues is good taste. Write

μία δ' εἰ[ξ]
[ἀλλᾶ]ν πρόκειται,
ὅς γε πᾶν χρέος κυβερνᾶ
[σὺν δι]καίαισι φρένεσσιν.

See viii 5 σὺν ἀλαθείᾳ δὲ πᾶν λάμπει χρέος.

xv 13 σὺν θεοῖς is unmetrical: the true reading may be ἡθέοις, for the sons of Antenor are the subject of the ode.

xv 48, 49.

Πλεισθενίδας Μενέλαος γάρυ' θελξιεπεί
φθέγγατ' εὐπέπλοισι κοινώσας Χάρισσιν.

Where is the object to κοινώσας? Probably εὐπέπλοις ἢ κοινώσας, i.e. γάρυ. Professor Platt restores εἰ at xix 5 where the metre requires it; Pindar uses it once at Ol. ix. 14 of the town of Opus; Homer applies it to inanimate things, as σκήπτρον at A 236.

xvii. On this ode and its metre I hope to write a special paper, so for the present I pass it by, and will only say that at 90 I should now write δόρυ, σὸ' οἱ νιν.

xviii 27-29 Πολυπήμονός τε καρτερὰν σφύ-
ραν ἐξέβαλεν Προκόπτας. This passage explains and is explained by Ovid Ibis 407 'ut Sinis et Sciron et cum Polypemone natus.' Procopetes is Polypemon's son, and apprenticed to his father.¹

xviii 33-36.

πότερα σὺν πολεμίοις ὀ-
πλοισι στρατιῶν ἄγοντα πολλὰν,
ἢ μόνον σὺν ὀπλοισιν
στείχειν, ἐμπορον οἱ ἀλάταν.

35 is neither sense nor verse, so Mr Kenyon proposes ἢ μόνον τ' ἀνοπλὸν τέ νιν. Write

ἢ μόνον συνοπαίων

¹ [See also note by Ellis.]

'without companions'. This was mistaken for σὺν ὁπαίων and altered to σὺν ὁπάσιν; and ΟΠΑΟCIN hardly differs from ΟΠ-ΛΟΙCIN.² There is no metrical cause to alter μόνον here nor κητύκτον at 50; and κνέην εὐτύκτον is Homeric.

xviii 50-54.

κητύκτον κνέαν Λάκαι-
ναν κρατὸς ὕπερ πυρσοχαίτον
χιτῶνα πορφύρεον
στέρνοις τ' ἀμφὶ καὶ οὐλίον
Θεσσαλᾶν χλαμύδ'.

In 51 there is an anapaest in lieu of a dactyl; in 53 the position of τε is ridiculous, for the word is meant to join κνέαν with χιτῶνα. Write κρατὸς θ' ὑπο in 51 and delete τ' in 53. The θ' was absorbed by the σ; ὑπο, thus rendered meaningless, was altered to ὑπερ; and τε, which now became necessary, was inserted in the only place which would receive it.

xix 12-15 should be written thus:

πρέπει σὲ φερτάταν ἔμεν
ὁδόν, παρὰ Καλλιόπας λα-
χοῖσαν ἐξοχὸν γέρας,
εἰ τιν'. Ἄργος κτλ.

I have put an accent on σε in 12 and written εἰ τιν' for τιν in 15. εἰ and ἦ are sometimes much alike in this hand. At 19 τότ' should be read, as Mr Kenyon proposes.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

iii. 21, 22. If space will permit θέλων may be right in place of the second θεόν. The position of γάρ is intolerable, and the sense of ἄριστον ὄλβον unsatisfactory. Whatever are the exact words, there can be little doubt as to the general meaning, and that Bacchylides alludes to the poetic commonplace first found in Hesiod *Op.* 320 χρήματα δ' οὐχ ἀρκατὰ, θεόσδοτα πολλὸν ἀμείνω· εἰ γάρ τις καὶ χερσὶ βίην μέγαν ὄλβον ἐλγεται...παῖρον δέ τ' ἐπὶ χρόνον ὄλβος ὀπηδεῖ. Then in Solon 13, 9 πλοῦτον δ' ὃν μὲν δώσει θεοὶ παραγίγνεται ἀνδρὶ ἐμπεδὸς ἐκ νεότητος πυθμένος εἰς κορυφὴν and Theognis 197 f. χρήμα δ', ὃ μὲν Διόθεν καὶ σὺν δίκῃ ἀνδρὶ γένηται καὶ καθαρῶς, αἰεὶ παρμόνιμον τελέθει. This point is more than once emphasised by Pindar; as in Nem. viii. 17 σὺν θεῷ γάρ τοι φυτευθεὶς ὄλβος ἀνθρώποιον

[The suggestion of σὺν ὁπάσιν has been sent to me simultaneously by Mr W. A. Golligher, G.E.M.]

παρμονώτερος. Cf. *fr.* 99, *Isthm.* iii. 4 foll. A consideration of these passages will, I hope, recommend the conjecture: θεὸν θεόν (or θέλων) τις ἀγλαΐζε, σῶς γὰρ ἄριστον ὄλβος. The first C was confused with Θ, and the second fell out accidentally as in xiii. 98. The disturbance at the end of the line is subsequent to the displacement of σῶς. σῶς γὰρ ἄριστος ὄλβων is, of course, possible but less clear, and the plural of ὄλβος I can only find in *Soph. frag.* 298.

iii. 67. Perhaps [οὐ ψέ]γειν, assuming that the sentence ends with πέμψαι in 66.

v. 48. νεόκροτον. This difficult epithet should probably be brought into connection with *Soph. El.* 714 ἐν δὲ πᾶς ἐμεστώθη δρόμος κτύπου κροτητῶν ἁρμάτων where see Jebb. It means then either (1) 'the fresh victory of the rattling car'—a view favoured by the Homeric ὄχεα κροτέοντες—or (2) 'the victory of the newly welded car.' The fact that the horse is the subject of the sentence makes the omission of any reference to the chariot less harsh.

v. 62. ἀπλάτοι' Ἐχίδνας. This elision, for which see Mr. Platt in *C.R.* ii. 99, is freely admitted by Bacchylides: cf. ix. 44, xvii. 42.

v. 107. πλῆμύρων rather than πλῆμυρῶν has been anticipated by Mr. Nairn. L. and S. are misleading as to these words.

v. 110. ἄν is ungrammatical, and is not to be defended by such doubtful passages as *Pind. Pyth.* 9, 129. The accent of the papyrus points rather to εἰσάνταν related to εἰσάνα as ἄντην to ἄντα.

ix. 55. The indications of the papyrus and the requirements of metre point to an adjective in -ωνυμος, such as μεγαλώνυμος or πολυώνυμος. Perhaps νᾶσον τ' ἐρατώνυμον Αἴγιναν cf. xvii. 32.

x. 10. Following up Mr. Nairn's suggestion that the name of the athlete is concealed here. I would propose Πασία, τὴν ἐκείνησιν κ.τ.λ.¹ Mr. Kenyon reports that the remains of the first letter suggest π. It is true that Bacchylides has τὴν in xviii. 14, but τὴν is accepted by Fennell and Bury in *Pind. Isthm.* v. 4 and is certain for Theocritus. The only objection is in the position of the accent which may, however, be misplaced, as seems to be sometimes the case, e.g. xi. 45.

xi. 110. For γὰρ δ', which is pointless, read ται δέ, which supplies the following verbs with their natural subject, and marks the change of situation. Cf. xiii. 58.²

xiii. 62. The clue to the restoration of

this line seems to be given by Pindar's descriptions of Aeginetan hospitality: see *Nem.* iii. 2 τὰν πολυξέναν Δωρίδα νᾶσον Αἴγιναν *ib.* iv. 12, v. 8, *Ol.* viii. 26. Surely this is also the meaning of ὀλβίαν ξείνοισι in Bacchyl. xii. 5 where Mr. Kenyon interprets otherwise. Here, therefore, we might read τὰν πόλιν in 61 and complete 62 with ξιναγέταν or ξείνοισ φάος.³

xiii. 67. ἀρσιμάχους is a strange word when compared with other compounds of ἀρσι-. Perhaps we should read ἀεξιμάχους.

xiii. 97. There is no reason why the deliberate οἰρία of the MS. should be altered to οἰρία. Βορέας is still the subject, and the phrasing is no less illogical than that of the well-known passages *Soph. Ai.* 674 δεινῶν τ' ἄημα πνευμάτων ἐκοίμισε στένοντα πόντον and *Verg. Aen.* 3, 69 placataque uenti dant maria. In what follows νότον ἐκόντος seems an impossible phrase, and the metre of the corresponding epodes points to — — — in the lacuna. Moreover, if we observe that the τ in 98 is almost not erased, the almost invariable practice of the corrector (A³) will indicate that σ written over the line is an addition to the text, and not a substituted letter. Then, no emendation is necessary and we may write: νότον δ' ἐκόν[τεσς] ἰς ἔπλησ'] ἰστίον ἀρπαλέως τ' ἀελπον κ.τ.λ.

xiv. 10. Why not δὲ τὸ παρ χειρὸς making the phrase strictly parallel to τὸ παρ ποδός *Pind. Pyth.* 3, 60 i.e. *his nearest business*?⁴ κυβερνᾶται is not certain, and the active κυβερνᾶ σὺν δικαίαισι φρένεσιν is preferable, cf. xiii. 152, xvii. 22.

xvii. 62. σὺ is more likely to have been lost here than τό.

xvii. 86. Why not τάφην? Amazement is as natural an emotion on Minos' part as joy, and the metre is no objection: cf. l. 43.

xvii. 90. I cannot help thinking that σόει is a genuine form belonging to the causative of the root q̄iey. The existence of this word is established by Hesychius' ἐσσομένην: see Brugmann *Gr.* ii. § 794 (iv. p. 327 Eng. Tr.).⁵ The sense 'sped on' is exactly what is required. The asyndeton is impressive and natural, since the clause is merely an amplification of what precedes, and would be introduced in prose by οὕτω. The length of the final vowel of δόρυ is not surprising in view of δορυ-σόςος and the prevailing Epic scansion before words from this root e.g. Ψ 198 ἔλγ τε σέυαιτο καίμεναι. Whether νείν is used of ships floating like νήχομαι and the Latin nare and natare, I cannot at present ascer-

¹ [See note by Platt.]

² [See also note by Platt.]

³ [Cf. note by Tyrrell.]

⁴ [See also note by Headlam.]

⁵ [See also notes by Ellis, Richards and Sandys.]

tain, but if this is objected to it would be easy to read *viv* or perhaps *vaiv*.

A. C. PEARSON.

24th Dec., 1897.

3. 16. φιλοξενίας? the three datives plural correspond. Cf. *πρώτος* for *πρώτοις* in 1. 30. 21. *γὰρ* is for *παρ*. Read *θεόν τις ἀγλαΐζέτω παρ' ἄριστον ὄλβον*, either *at time of* or *on account of* (Pind. *Ol.* 2. 71).¹ The suggested *θεόν τις ἀγλαΐζε*, would be like *praise God somebody*: ἀγλαΐζέτω *τις* is quite different and unexceptionable. If we go by the MS. correction, we might read *παρ* (= *πάρεστιν*) ἄριστος ὄλβον, but I prefer the other. 63. *ὅσοι γε μὴν* (cf. 90) Ἑλλάδ' ἔχουσιν, οὗτις ὁ μεγαλύνει Ἱέρων θελήσει αὐχέιν σέο πλείονα χρυσὸν Λοξία πέμψαι βροτῶν· εὖ λέγειν κ.τ.λ.² 88. *παρὲντα γῆρας* would mean that a man cannot at the very end of old age recover youth, as though he could at the beginning. Take therefore *προέντα dismissing*: it can hardly be *postponing*.

4. 19. Can *παντοδαπῶν* mean *open to all comers*?

5. 8. ἐπάθρησον (13. 194)? 27. *νωμᾶται* governs *ἔθειραν*. 48. Perhaps *λαόκροτον*: cf. 9. 35: 3. 9 (1). *ἵεται*, if right, must not be taken as historic present, which B. like Pindar does not use. 110. Read *εἰσάνταν* with the MS.³: *ἀν* here is a solecism. 121. *πρός δ' ὄλεσε μοῖρ'* ὁλοῦ πλείνας: something like this the context requires. 142. Althea's tears are also in Ovid. *Met.* 8. 470: cf. Swinburne's *Atalanta* p. 101. May not *ἐγ*-be right, *weeping over him*? 151. Certainly adopt Mr. Purser's *μυνίνθη*. The aorist is right, for the weakness fell on Meleager quite suddenly: cf. Ovid and Swinburne. Read *μυνίνθη* also in 3. 90 for *μυνίθει*. 161. *μηδ'*? 195. *πιέθωμαι* means perhaps that he does what Hesiod says. Should we write *πέμπων*?

9. 10. *κινάσπιδες*? 40 foll. Well may Mr. Kenyon say that the sense, as he gives it, is not satisfactory. The father of Thebe and Aegina, as of many other geographical nymphs (47-50), was the river-god Asopos (Pind. *I.* 8. 17: Herod. 5. 80: Diod. 4. 72: Pausan. 2. 5. 2): he therefore, not Ares, is the *πολυγῶλος ἀναξ* of 45.⁴ Phlius and Nemea are not far from the Asopos. The general sense of 42-46 is that the Amazons and Troy felt the might of Heracles. I

cannot yet deal with *σῶν* (*σῶν τ'*)...*ποταμῶν ἔγγονοι*; but I hope Mr. Housman (who in *Athenaeum* of Dec. 25, has anticipated me on three or four points) sees further. Remove the comma after *ἦλθεν* in 41.

10. 13 foll. *τεὰν ἀρετὰν μανῶν ἐπιχθονίουσιν*, ὅσσον αὖ Νίκας κ.τ.λ. The genitive *ἀρετὰν* is awkward and *ὅσσα* hardly possible. I have also thought of *ὅστε σὰν Νίκας*. αὖ would be explained by 27. 28. Perhaps *βραβέων*. 37. Better not to insert anything confidently, where there are many other possibilities, e.g. *ἐμβαίνων*. 43. *ἐργοισιν* is husbandry.

11. 30. *εὐτυχέωνθ'* is infelicitous. Poets are flatterers and impute desert. Many things are possible, e.g. *ἐς πόλιν ὄλβιον χ' ἰκίσθαι*. 43. *ἐφόβησεν*. 120. *ἔσσαν* for *ἔσσαντο* in this use is questionable. Keep therefore *ἔσσάμενοι* and look for a verb in *προγόνοι*, the more so as its second syllable should be long. Is *προῶγον* possible?

13. 28. *χρυσῶν*? 38. *νοστής*? 46. *τοι* is pronoun, not particle (index). 119. Perhaps *ἐναριζομένων φωτῶν δ' ἐρεθέθ'* αἵματι. For the position of *δέ* compare *Frag.* 1. 7 *Διὸς εὐκλείου δέ* and *τε* in 18. 53 *χιτῶνα πορφύρεον στέρνοισ τ' ἄμφι*, if right. 125. *αὐχέοντες*? 195 foll. has some strange things. *τάν* is very awkward after *τάν* in 193, and B., though not a great poet, is a skilled workman. *εἰ κε* with indicative here is stranger than the examples in Monro's *Hom. Gram.* § 324, for they are past possibilities, this a supposed fact. In what sense can Clio be called *πανθαλής*, and is the second a long or short?

14. 8. *μία δ' ἐκ πασῶν πρόκειται εἰ τὸ παρ' χειρὸς κυβερνᾶται*. Cf. Pindar's *γνόντα τὸ παρ' ποδὸς Pyth.* 3. 60 etc. 59. Read *ἀ*. I doubt if *ἀ* would be so used after the article: moreover 62-3 is the main predication, answering to 56.

17. Several difficulties in this ode can be removed by transposition of words. The method is no doubt dangerous, but the cases should all be considered together and in the light of the fact that the MS. gives us in this ode irregularities certainly transcending metrical license. 10. *κίπριδος αἰνὰ δῶρα* surely an unsuitable epithet: *αἴψα*? or *ἄβρά*? 38. I have thought of *ἰώπλοκοι προ|κάλυμμα, or ἰώπλοκοι κά|λυμμι* - . . . 42. Possibly *ἀμβρόσιοι* ἰδεῖν ἑρᾶνδ' ἄοις φάος. 68. *Μίνω* with an iambus omitted before it, e.g. *ἐκόν*. 72. *πέτασε χεῖρας* or possibly *χέρα πέτασεν tenditque ad sidera dextram* (Virg. *Aen.* 12. 196). 74. *σύ* is unsuitable, especially in view of 76: read *Θηρεῦ, τῷδε μὲν ἔβλεπες*. 86. Perhaps *νιὸς δέ Διὸς*

¹ [See also note by Housman.]

² [See also notes by Platt, Sandys and Tyrrell.]

³ [See also notes by Platt, Sandys and Headlam.]

⁴ [See also note by Housman.]

ἔνδοθεν κίερα τάφε. τάφε (e.g. in ταφὼν ἀνόρουσε) does not connote immobility. 90. σόει should not be dismissed too confidently. Some such word seems presupposed by the middle forms σοῖσθε, σοῖνται, etc. (Veitch s.v. σόομαι). σόει (or σόειν) γάρ | νιν may be suggested. If νειν=νιν, compare the MS. mistakes in 67 and 107.¹ 93. Insert μέν, and not πᾶν, comparing 13. 169-70. 94. Perhaps πόντονδε θόρεν ἦρος κατὰ | τε λειρίων ὀμμάτων δα|κρύχειον. 101. Putting μέγαρον in 100 with Mr. Housman, write here μόλεν. 102. ἔδεις' ὀλβίωιο Νη|ρέος κόρας? But 103 seems metrically doubtful. 108. ποσσί. 109. Mr. Housman and Mr. Platt agree in suggesting σεμνὴν τε πατὴρ ἄλοχον φίλαν ἴδε, an improvement, but incomplete, because we want a long syllable in the sixth place. Read something like σεμνὴν τότ' ἄλοχον πατὴρ φίλαν. 118. There seems no evidence that ᾧ I wish was suited to lyric or epic. θέλωσιν may stand for another word much used of the gods, θῶσιν. Cf. τεύχει in the parallel 3. 57 ἄπιστον οὐδὲν ὁ τι θεῶν μέριμνα τεύχει.

In the passage of Apollodorus quoted to illustrate 20 read δέισασα ὡς ἂν <γυνή> μὴ γηρώσαν αὐτήν 'Α. καταλίπη: in that given on p. 101 for καὶ κατὰ γαστρός μὲν ἔτι ὄντες read καὶ κατὰ γαστρός μητρὶ (or μητρὶ ἔτι) ὄντες, for καὶ...μὲν is hardly possible and μὴ often gets confused with μέν.

All the above to be regarded as suggestions merely.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

THE following is a conspectus of the readings proposed by Prof. BLASS in the *Literarisches Centralblatt* for Dec. 25. It is interesting to notice that in several instances Prof. Housman and Prof. Platt in the *Athenaeum* of the same date, and Mr. Nairn in the *Classical Review* for December, have lighted on the same suggestions. I may add that Prof. Blass examined the *paragrus* in August last.

i 2-6, ἐκ τοῦ μὲν γένος ἐπλετο κρατερόχειρ 'Αργείος, — — — λέοντος θυμὸν ἔχων, ὅποτε ζαχρεῖος ἀντιβολοῖ μάχας (sc. ὁ λέων). Cf. Πιάδ 4, 342 μάχης ἀντιβολήσται. 8, καλῶν, τόσα κ.τ.λ.

ii 4, ὅτι μέγας θρασύχειρ 'Αργείος ἄρατο νίκαν.

iii 22, θεόν, θεόν τις ἀγλαΐζτω, ὁ (by crasis ἀγλαΐζεθῶ) γὰρ ἄριστος ὀλβίων. 33, (πυρὰν) ναῆσαι. 44, φοινίσσεται αἵματι χρυσοδίνας

Πακτωλός, cf. xiii 131. 63, ὅσοι <γε> μὲν 'Ελλάδ' ἔχουσιν, οὕτως...θέλησεν — σέο πλείονα χρυσὸν Λοξία πέμψαι βροτῶν. 67, εὖ λέγειν. 69, εὐθαλῆ...ἀνδρ' ἀρήϊον. 78, Φερη-τιάδα.

iv 4, παρ' ὀμφαλόν. 14, πάρεστίν νιν (cf. iii 67) and γαίας. 6, ὠκυπόδων ἀρεταῖς σὺν ἵππων.

v 110, εἰσάνταν.² 191, ὃν <ἂν> ἀθάνατοι τιμῶσιν αὐτοί (i), καὶ βροτῶν φήμαν ἔπεισθαι, cf. Theognis 169 ὃν δὲ θεοὶ τιμῶσ', ὃν καὶ μωμεύμενος αἰνεῖ (Prof. Housman's proposal is nearly identical, differing only in τούτῳ, which is better than αὐτοί).

vii 7, ἀρισταλκῆς (Mr. Nairn proposes the same).

viii 6, οὕτως ἀνθρώπων καθ' ἑλλανας ἐν ἄλκι χρόνῳ παῖς ἔων ἀνὴρ τέ πω πλείυνας ἐδέξατο νίκας.

ix 2-3, ἐπεὶ Μουσᾶν γε. 4, Φλειοῦντα and εὐτυχος should be retained, the latter referring with Μουσᾶν προφάτας, who is the poet. 10, κέθι φοινικὰς πιδεις ἡμίθει (so also Prof. Housman). 18, ὑφαίρεται νόημα, cf. xi 54. 21-23, πλαθέντ'. ἀλλ' ἔτι κείνων. 23, remove full-stop after Νεμέα. 28, in *paragrus* φάει! 38, πελάσσαις or (with Kenyon) πελάσσας. 39, Ἄσσω πὸν παρὰ πορφυροδίναν (so also Prof. Housman). 55, ἡ τῶν μεγαλῶνιμον Αἴγιναν, μεγίστου ἂ Διὸς πλαθεῖσα (similarly Housman) τέκεν ἦρω.³ 72, χρυσέαν...θεντα ἰσπλόκον εὖ εἰπείν Κύπριν. ὦ μᾶτερ ἀγνάμπτων ἐρώτων. 88, εἰσὶ δ' ἀνθρώπων.

x 10, νασιώτων. 37, κέλευθον, ἄντινα στείχων. 46, διακρίτους. 47, πᾶ (so also Mr. Nairn). 51, γλώσσαν, cf. v 196 (so also Housman).

xi 9, κούρα Στρυγὸς ὀρθοδίκου (i.e. Νίκη). 30, πορτιτρόφον ἂν πεδίον πάτραν θ' ἰκέσθαι. 110, ταῖ (Housman and Platt).

xiii 61, παρθένου μέλπουσι τεὸν κράτος, ὦ δέσποινά καὶ Ζηνός, sc. Artemis. 77, εἰσὶτε Πηλεΐδας θρασείαν αἰχμὰν — — — ὀρίαντο, Δαρδανιδᾶν τ' ἔλυσεν ἄλκᾶν. 83, οὐ λείπον. 84, πτάσσον (v 22).⁴ 91, perhaps ὥστ' ἐν κνανανθεῖ θύων ναντίλους πόντῳ Βορέας ὑπὸ κύμασιν δαΐζει. 97, νότου δ' ἐκόλπωσαν σὺν (v 28) αἶραις ἰστίον ἀρπαλέως τ' ἄελπτον ἐξέκοντο χέρσον. 100, ἐπεὶ κλύον (as once proposed by Mr. Kenyon). 105, θεοῖσιν. 125, πνέοντες ὑπερφίαλον. 134, ἐρεψιλάοις. 175, δυσμενέων δὲ ματαίας λαιδορίας μινύθει.

xiv 22, Πυρρίχου τ' εὐδοξὸν ἱππόνικον νῖον. xv 2, δάμαρ κνανῶπις, Ἀθάνας πρόσπολος (sc. Theano).

xvi 3, Πιερίαν ἐπὶ φρένας (i) Οὐρανία.

² [See also notes by Headlam, Platt and Richards.]

³ [See also notes by Headlam and Richards.]

⁴ [See also notes by Platt and Thomas.]

¹ [See also notes by Sandys and Pearson.]

xvii 10, ἀβρά (Mr. Kenyon's first reading).
67, ἀμπετον? 86, τᾶκεν. 90, σόει νιν.¹

xix 43, λινοστόλων. 46, ὅθεν καὶ Ἀγαγο-
ρίδας ἐν ἐπταπύλοισι Θήβαις Κάδμος Σεμέλαν
ἔφυσεν. 50, δῖον νῖον.

xx 2, the mark of a short syllable over
the second α in ξανθαι points to ξανθαί (not
ξανθά). If so, I may suggest, instead of my
proposal in the *Athenaeum* for Dec. 25, the
following restoration of the eleven remaining
lines of the ode (the additions are denoted
by spaced type):—

Σπάρτη ποτ' ἐν [ῆρι γυναιῖκες
ξανθαὶ Λακεδαίμονίσι
τοιόνδε μέλος κ[ατὰ] ῥ[ο]ν θ'.
ὅτ' ἄγετο καλλιπα[χυν
κόραν θρασυκάρ[διος] Ἰδας
Μάρπησσαν ἰδ[ὲ] π[ο]κον, αἶσαν
φυγῶν θανάτου [μ]ε[λ]αιναν,
ἵππους τέ οἱ ἰσαν[έ]μους θεί[ης] [?],
Πλευρῶν' ἐς ἐκτ[ε]πον ὥρσεν
χρυσάσπιδος νῖδ[ον] Ἀρηος...

ξανθὰ is an epithet of γυνά in Bacchylides
xiii 103, of Hera and Athene in xi 57 and
v 92, and of Athene and the Graces in
Pindar, who also has γυναιξὶ καλλικόμοισιν
of the women of Argos.

J. E. SANDYS.

iii. 21-2.

I propose to read

θεόν, θεόν τις
ἀγλαΐζεθ'. ὅς γὰρ ἀριστος ὄλβων.

The corrector, who in the great majority of
cases is right, gives ἀριστος ὄλβων. For the
plural with τις cf. Terence *Ad.* iv. 4. 27
aperite aliquis actutum ostium, Plaut. *Ps.* vi.
1. 37, *nunciate quis*, Thuc. ii. 53 ἐτόλμα τις
... ὄρωντες.

iii. 63-68.

ὅσοι μὲν Ἑλλάδ' ἔχουσιν, οὗτις
ὁ μ[ε]γαλύνετε ἱέρων, θελήσει
[...]ν [σ]έο πλείονα χρυσὸν
[...]μ πέμψαι βροτῶ
[...]ειν πάρεστιν ὅς
[τις μ]ὴ φθόνῳ πιαίνετα[ι].

The word required in l. 66 is, I think, Λοξίη,
while for l. 65 I suggest φάμεν or φάσκειν
'No one will care to claim to have sent
more gold to Loxias than you.' The verb

¹ [See also notes by Ellis, Pearson and Richards.]

depending upon πάρεστιν will be some equiv-
alent of κρίνειν.

iii. 87.

εὐφροσύνα δ' ὁ χρυσός.

εὐφροσύνα plainly refers back to the εὐφρανε
θυμόν of l. 83 and is therefore the subject.
The question therefore arises whether ὁ χρυ-
σός could mean 'as good as gold.' But ὁ
χρυσός may stand.

iii. 96-8.

σὺν δ' ἀλαθ[εῖα] καλῶν
καὶ μελιγλώσσου τις ὕμνησι χάριν
κηίας ἀνδρόνος.

Kenyon translates "'naming him with
truth,' i.e. in praising Bacchylides he may
truthfully be called 'the honey-tongued
nightingale of Ceos'". But the sense seems
to me to be this 'Over a prosperous man
silence is not creditable, and with truth
shall he be sung by grace of (χάριν) the
Cean nightingale.' For καλῶν I suggest
βαλῶν 'conjecturing', cf. οὐ ψεύδει βαλῶν
Pind. N. i. 28, &c. χάριν may either be taken
as above, or in the sense of 'meed of praise,'
for which cf. Bacch. xiv. 19-21 Κλεοποτόλῳ
δὲ χάριν—νῦν χρῆ—κελαδῆσαι, Pind. I. iv.
123-4 σὺν Ὀρσέα δὲ νιν κομᾶζομαι, τερπνὰν
ἀποστάζων χάριν Ol. x. 115 and commonly.
The former sense is, of course, also common,
e.g. Διὸς χάριν Pind. P. iii. 168, ἀλαθείας χάριν
'by way of truth' Bacch. v. 187. The two
senses run together perhaps here, as in
Pind. Ol. x. 95.

v. 16. δυσπαίπαλα κύματα. δυσπαίπαλα
is almost certainly right in the sense of
'restless' (connected with πᾶλλω, cf. παιφάσ-
σω δαιδάλλω Φαιφίσσω δαίδαλος etc.) and
corresponds to the ἀμαιμάκετον in the parallel
passage concerning the eagle Pind. P. i. 28.
v. 150.

The proposal to take μίννθα as a verb =
ἐμνίνθη requires a final -η, which would not
become α in any ordinary Doric dialect. I
may add two similar minutiae, προφάτας ix.
3 should, according to the rule given
Introd. p. xlvii, be προφήτας: we have
προφᾶται x. 28, but cf. κυβερνήτας xii. 1 and
κυβερνᾶται xiv. 10. Again ἔψανχης xiii. 4 7
(corrector) would only in Elean become
ἔψανχας (original hand and ed.).

ix. 1-6.

δόξαν, ὃ χρυσάλακατοι χάριτες,
πεισίμβροτον δόητ' ἔπει
Μουσαί τε ἰοβλεφάρων θεῶς προφήτας,
εὐτυκον Φλιούντᾳ τε καὶ Νεμειῶν
Ζηνὸς εὐθαλὲς πέδον
ὑμνείν. ὅθι κ.τ.λ.

In addition to the other difficulties here noted by the editor we must call attention to the fact that the left-hand column gives *εὐτυχος*, and this, if really the reading of the papyrus, is certainly right.¹ For it goes easily with *ὑμνεῖν* in the sense of 'ready (in trim) to praise,' cf. L. and S., while it is extremely questionable whether *εὐτυχος πόλις*, to say nothing of *εὐτυχος Φλιοῦς*, would be Greek. Again, *ἐπει* is very curiously used for *ἔπει* or *μέλει*. Now the sense will be free from all difficulty if we read, *δοίητ', ἐπεὶ Μουσᾶν τε ἰοβλεφάρων θ' ὑμῶν (ῥμός) προφίτας εὐτυχος κ.τ.λ.*, where *ὑμῶν* = *χαρίτων*, and this is supported by xix. 4-5.

ὡς ἂν παρὰ Πιερίδων λά-
χῃσι δῶρα Μουσᾶν
ἰοβλέφαροί τε καὶ
φερεστέφανοι χάριτες
βάλωσιν ἄμφι τιμᾶν
ῥμνοῖσιν.

where we have the Muses and Graces again together with *ἰοβλέφαροι* applying to the latter. The source of the corruption may be readily explained if we suppose *θείος* a correction for *θ' ῥμος* misread as *θυμος*. For *ῥμός* and the construction cf. Pind. P. vii. 14-16 *δύο δ' ἀπὸ Κίρρας, ὦ Μεγάκλεες, ὑμαί τε καὶ προγόνων*. ix. 27-9.

ὡς ἄστρον διακρίνει φάη-σελάνα

Has not *διακρίνει* here a simple local sense 'parts' sc. 'moves among'?

ix. 55. The adjective with *Ἀγιναν* might be *δολιχῆρετμον* (Pind. O. viii. 27) or *εὐνομον* (Pind. I. v. 28).

ix. 83. *τό[δε] τοι καλὸν ἔργον*. Read *τὸ δέ τοι, κ.τ.λ.*

x. 46. *ἀκρίτους (τελευταίς)* 'indiscriminate' Kenyon: but ? 'uncertain' 'unknown,' cf. L. and S.

xi. 118-120.

ἄλσος τέ τοι ἡμερόεν
Κάσαν παρ' εὐνδρον πρόγο-
νοι ἐσσάμενοι, Πριάμοι' ἐπεὶ κ.τ.λ.

May not the right reading be *κτίσαν*? *εὐνδρον*, which will then go with *ἄλσος*, is generally used of *land*. *πρόγονοι* = *their* ancestors.

xii. 4-6.

ἐς γὰρ ὀλβίαν
ξείνοισί με πότνια Νίκα
ναῖσιν Ἀγίνας ἄπαρχει.

¹ [See also note by Housman.]

For *ἀπαρχει*, *ἀπαιτεῖ* and *ἐπαίρει* are proposed. But *ἐπαίρει* would better maintain the nautical metaphor in *κυβερνήτας—εὐθύνε*, and I suggest the perfect *ἀπαρκεν*.

xiii. 6. *παρθένοι μέλπονσι τ[εὸν γόνον]* ὦ . *τεὸν γόνον* = *Aeacus*. In the next line read *δέσποινα παρξείνου δίκας*, comparing Pind. N. iv. 18-19, *Ol. viii. 28, N. xi. 9*, where this combination of justice and hospitality is ascribed to *Aegina*.

xiii. 84.

ἀνυζόμενοι δὲ
[πτ]ᾶσσαν ὀξείαν μάχαν.

πτᾶσσαν is suggested by Mr. W. B. Thomas: *ὀξείαν μάχαν* is governed by *ἀνυζόμενοι*. The form *πτᾶσσω* occurs above V. 20 and also in Pindar: cf. the use of *πτᾶσσω* in Homer of shirking battle.²

xiii. 97-9. Read *νότον δ' ἐκόν[τος ἔξσαν]* *ιστίον ἀρπαλέως τ' ἄελπτον ἐξίκοντο χέρσον*. For *ἔξσαν* *ιστίον* cf. Pind. P. i. 176-7 *ἔξλει... ιστίον*. But *εἰλκυσαν* would do.

xiii. 100-105.

ὡς Τρῶες ἐπ[έ]κλυον . . . θεοῖσι δ' ἄντειναν
χέρας.

A better sense will be given by

ὡς Τρῶες, ἐπεὶ κλύον . . . θεοῖσιν ἄντειναν
χέραν.

xiii. 124. *ἡ μεγάλαισιν κ.τ.λ.* Read *ῆ*.

xiii. 193, 4. Perhaps read

τὰν ἐμοὶ Λάμπων [πόρεν ἀλικίας]
βληχρὰν ἐπαθρήσας [τέχραν].

ἐπαθρήσας = *ἐπαθρήσας*, and *βληχρὰν* refers to *childish* skill, as xi. 65 to *childish* strife: cf. *βληχρή, βληχάομαι*.

xvi. 22. *ὑψικέραν*. Kenyon can scarcely be right in saying that this is for *ὑψικέρων* 'like Ποσειδᾶν for Ποσειδῶν'. The latter is a case of Doric contraction of *-ᾶων*. If the *a* is really long, we must compare Pindar's *ὑψικέρατα*.

F. W. THOMAS.

THE Editor and the scholars who have so brilliantly assisted him have rightly resolved to adhere as closely as possible to the MS. in the *editio princeps* of Bacchylides. Accordingly, they have rarely admitted a conjecture, except when the claims of metre were inexorable. In some cases the editor has

² [See also note by Sandys and Platt.]

admitted into the text a reading with which he owns himself to be dissatisfied. These are cases in which it is a question whether the text can be defended, or whether we must not have recourse to emendation. The following short notes refer chiefly to cases of this kind and to passages in which the reading of the MS. must admittedly be abandoned.

It seems to me that the editor, in drawing up his metrical schemes, might well have assumed that the last syllable of the verse is always common. I know such is not the custom of metricists. Bergk, for instance, in the second Olympic ode marks every line of the five strophes and antistrophes and every line but one of the five epodes as having the last syllable common. Would it not be more scientific to say that the last syllable of every line is common, and that when five epodes agree in one verse only in having a long syllable at the end this phenomenon is due to chance? In the Bacchylides where a common syllable is found I should be disposed to regard it (if possible) as marking the end of a line.

If the last syllable of each verse is not common, then *synapheia* exists, as in the tragic anapaestic dimeter. In that case the verse may end with an elided syllable, if the next begins with a vowel. But in this MS. *no such license is permitted*. The verse often ends in the middle of a word, but the elision is always brought over to the beginning of the next verse. Thus ὑμνοάσας' xii. 1, 2, φῶθ' xvi. 15, 16, θέλωμ' xvii. 41, 42. Is not this an express statement that there is no *synapheia*, and consequently that the last syllable of every verse is common?

iii. 21, 22. In the reading given in the *editio princeps* γὰρ is not only out of its place, but it is hard to see what it could mean. I would suggest

θεὸν θέλοντες
ἀγλαΐζεθ' ᾧ παρ' ἄριστος ὄλβων.¹

For θέλοντες cp. ἐθέλων v. 169, θελήσας φρονήσας τ' Soph. *O.T.* 649, and the common epic usage whereby θέλων means 'zealously' 'gladly.' In the MS. εἰ is often confounded with ι and ει. For παρά signifying 'in the gift of' cp. xiv. 1.

εἷ μὲν εἰμάρθαι παρὰ δαίμοσιν ἀν-
θρώποις ἄριστον,

and παρὰ δαίμοσι κείται ix. 84. Πάρα in anastrophe is found in xvi. 35.

¹ [See also note by Platt.]

As to ἄριστος ὄλβων, there is nothing really objectionable in the plural, which is actually found in a fragment of Sophocles, and Bacchylides has a stronger anomaly in the plural in παμμαχιᾶν xiii. 43, εὐφροσύναι xi. 12. The three passages fortify each other. The plural is the correction of A², and it will be observed that in nearly every other case the editor has acquiesced in the view of the corrector.

In ode v., line 11 and the corresponding antistrophic line 26 have a syllable more than in the other strophes. The same is the case with ll. 14 and 29. Mr. R. J. Walker in the *Athenaeum*, December 18, brings ll. 14 and 29 into conformity by easy changes which I accept. In 14 he omits δέ. This asyndeton is characteristic; cp. xvii. 119 and (probably) 90. In 29 he reads ἀρίγνωτος, omitting μετ' in the next verse to the great improvement of the sense. But when we come to l. 11 and the corresponding antistrophic verses, the case is different. It is impossible to bring them into conformity by omitting a syllable. It will not do to read πλεῖ for such a characteristic word as πέμπε in

νάσον ξένος ὑμετέραν πέμ-
-πει κλεινὰν ἐς πόλιν.

We must therefore see if there are not signs of a syllable having dropped out in the corresponding ll. 51, 66, 91, 106, 131, 146, 171, 186. In all these places the added syllable is natural, in some there is a very good reason why it should have fallen out, and in some it renders change of another kind unnecessary. The ll. as emended will run thus (I add the following verse when necessary):

- 51. μοῖράν τε καλῶν ἔπορ' <ἔργων>
- 66. Ἴδας ἀνὰ μηλοβότοιο.
- 91. πέμψει κεφαλᾶ· τὰ δέ δήπου
- 106. ὅς καλλιχόρου Καλυδῶνος
ἄντα πλημυρῶν σθένει.
- 131. κρίνει φίλον ἐν πολέμοισιν.
- 146. παῖδ' ἀλκιμον ἐξεναρίζων,
ζών, ἀμώμητον δέμας,
πύργων προτάρσιβε κινήσας.
- 171. ψυχὰ προσέφα Μελεάγρον,
κάλλιπον χλωραύχενα.
- 185. Ἴέρωνι φέρων
εὐδαμονίας πέταλον <ὄν>

In 51 some such word as ἔργων is almost necessary. 66. the adjective goes better with Ἴδας, as πρῶνας has another epithet. 91. δήπου is much more suitable than πον, and the δη- would have fallen out after δέ. 106.

The change preserves δς of the MS. as well as the uniformity of metre, though it introduces other alterations. 146. The ζών in 147 would certainly have been omitted as a dittography of ἐξενάρειζον. The word is suitable: Meleager came on Clymenus 'still surviving,' 'not yet slain' like the rest. Cp. *P.* 445

αἶ κε ζών πέμψης Σαρπηδόνα ὅνδε δόμενδε

185. The word πέταλον is strange. It cannot mean that the Olympian victory was the 'bud, source' of the prosperity of Hiero, because this victory was certainly preceded by a famous one at Delphi. It must mean 'a vote' as in *I.* viii. (vii.) 46, and the contribution which the victorious Pherenicus made to the prosperity of Hiero is called *his* vote for his happiness. Cp. an equally strange use of ψάφον in *P.* iv. 265. The addition of ὃν *euum* is all but essential, and would very easily have fallen out.

v. 129. We should read 'Αφαρηῆα for 'Αφάρητα. The gen. of 'Αφαρεύς is 'Αφαρέως, and the τ seems to have got into the MS. here and in *Pind.* *N.* x. 111 through a confusion with Φέρης -ητος. Here the MS. gives ΑΦΑΡΗΑΤΑ with the α struck out. The corrector seems to have intended to strike out the T, but to have deleted the A by mistake. Ovid *M.* viii. 304 has the right form in *Aphareia proles*.

v. 142. The change of ἐκλαύσασα to ἀγκλαύσασα is bolder than it looks, because the poet would have made more of the thought if he had wished to describe Althaea as weeping at her own act in bringing about the death of Meleager by burning the magic log. By reading ἐγκλάσασα or ἐγκλάξασα we should have a common idiom, whereby καίε φιτρὸν ἐγκλείσασα = καίε φιτρὸν ὃν ἐνέκλεισε. Cp. *Soph. Ag.* 676 λύει πεδίστας = λύει οὓς ἐπέδησε.

vi. 4. The words δι' ὅσα παύοιθεν... ᾄσαν could only mean 'on account of all the songs they sang of yore' and this gives no sense. A slight change would be Διὸς δὲ παύοιθεν 'before the face of Zeus,' and this would suit the context well: Lacon had formerly won at Olympia and then his victory was sung there 'in the presence of' Zeus of Olympia; now another Olympian victory is being celebrated, but now it is at his own home in Ceos. Zeus is called 'Ολύμπιος = 'of Olympia' in *I.* v. 8.

ix. 28. The meaning ascribed to διακρίνει seems hardly possible. Qu. διαχραίνει, 'blurs them,' 'pales their ineffectual fires.' Cp. κατέχρανεν v. 44 used in a similar sense.

NO. CII. VOL. XII.

Perhaps also δι' ἀκταίνει is possible. The word is intrans. according to the ancient lexicographers.

ix. 45, 46.

σὼν, ὃ πολυζήλωτ' ἀναξ, ποταμῶν
ἔγγονοι γεύσαντο καὶ ὑφιπύλου Τροίας ἔδος.

It is hard to see how σὼν can be explained. I would read τῶν, taking ἐχέων as the antecedent, governed by γεύσαντο. The 'sons of River-Gods' before Troy on both sides 'had proof of' the spears (for and against them) of the Amazons. Achilles and Ajax on the Greek side were descended from the River-God Asopus; Nestor was son of Neleus son of Enipeus; Asteropaeus on the Trojan side was the grandson of Axius, and the speech of Achilles to him, *Φ* 184 ff., shows in what esteem River-Gods were held as progenitors. In *O.* xiii. 55 ff. Pindar expressly speaks of the glory of being connected with heroes of the Trojan war on both sides. The expl. given in the note seems hardly possible. Jebb's καθ' for καὶ is surely right.

ix. 82. Perhaps we might supply ἀρτεμέα. The meaning seems to be that the song preserves the victory as a *secure* heirloom.

x. 11. The corrupt word probably conceals the name of the brother-in-law who 'stirred up the islanders' (*νασιωτῶν*) singing bee' to compose the ode of victory.

x. 15. For ὅσα <νῦν> read ὁσάκι which simplifies the constr., and -κίς would more easily fall out before νικ-.

x. 37. Perhaps ἂν τι[ς ἐμβαίν]ων would be a more natural expression. Pindar uses ἐμβαίνειν in this sense with the dative; the accus. however is quite right, as in *Eur. Suppl.* 989.

xi. 32, 33. παῖδ' ἐν χθονὶ καλλιχόρῳ
ποικίλαις τέχναις πέλασεν

Translate 'he brought the boy who opposed him to the ground by his cunning.' It is the verb ἐμπελάω in *imesis*. So in *N.* viii. 38 Bergk rightly reads καγ χθονὶ γυῖα καλύψαιμ'.

xi. 65. Would not βληχᾶς ἀπ' ἄκρας = *a primo vagitu*, be a natural expression for 'from their infancy?' Cf. *Pyth.* v. 7, αἰῶνος ἀκρὰν βαθμίδων ἀπο.

xii. 6. For ἑπάρχει† we might perhaps read ἐπάρκει = ἐπέρκει the pluperf. of ἐπαίρω. The sense 'had urged, impelled' seems to be required. Bergk in *N.* iv. 46 reads ἀπάρκει *secessit* for ἀπάρχει, quoting from *Hesychius* ἀπῆρκεν ἀπεδήμηκεν.

xiii. 19, 20. The words ἐλθεῖν and ἐγνάμφθη

would seem to be more suitably supplied than *πείρειν* and *ἐστρέφειν*, regard being had to epic usage.

xiii. 39, 40. The words *βαστάσας* and *κανχήμασιν* would suit the metre and have Pindaric usage in their favour.

xiii. 49. *πυρσὸν ὧς Ἑλλ[ασιν ἀλκῶν]
φαίνων.*

It would be better to supply *ῥυμνον* instead of *ἀλκῶν*. Pindar often compares his song to a flame or light, and likens it to a torch in *I. iii. (iv.) 61* *ἄψαι πυρσὸν ῥυμνων*. The verb *φαίνειν* often means 'to bring to light' in the sense of 'to be the occasion of' e.g. in *I. 3, 20*, *εὐμαχανίαν γὰρ ἔφανας... ῥυμνω*.

xiii. 62. Probably the word to be supplied is *ξειναγέτι*. Pindar in apostrophising Aegina constantly dwells on her hospitality, e.g. *N. iii. 2, iv. 12*.¹

xiii. 122, 123. Perhaps we might read

**ἄγχι μέγ' ἡμιθέιος
ἰόντος (or πρέποντος) ἰσόθεον δὲ ὁρμάν.*

Pindar uses *ἄγχι* = 'like,' *ἀγχοῦ* = 'near.' The word *ἡμιθέιος* seems to suggest that Hector is likened to the demigods. The use of *διὰ* is characteristic of Pindar.

xiii. 127-130. The passage seems to describe the hopes entertained by the Trojans and might have run somewhat thus:—

*ἦ μεγάλασιν ἐλπίσιν
κλάζοντες ὑπερφιάλον
ἔθρεψαν εὐχῶν
Τρῶες ἱππευταὶ κυανώπιδας ἐκ-
-φλέξαντας (or ἐκφλέξαντας) Ἑλλάνων νέας
λοιπαῖς χάριν εὐλαπίνας τ' ἐν
ἀμέραις ἔξεν θεόδοτον πόλιν.*

Pindar often uses *λοιπὸς* for 'future.'

xiii. 144. Read *δνόφουσιν*. The plur. of *δνόφος* is found Aesch. *Cho. 52*. I do not think any plur. of *σκοτός* occurs.

xiii. 193, 4. The passage probably ran

*τὰν ἐμοὶ Λάμπων παρέχων ξενίως
βληχρὸν ἐπαθρήσαι στάγα
τὰν κ.τ.λ.*

'and may Lampon extending this friendship to me look in friendly wise on that little drop (of inspiration) with which if Clio has really inspired me (τὰν εἴγ' ἐτύμως ἄρα Κλειὼ ἐμαῖς ἐνόσταξεν φρεσίν) lovely lays will herald him to all the host.' Ap. Rh. iv. 624 has

¹ [Cf. note by Pearson.]

στάγες, and Weil's *στάγας* for *ἀγὰς* is now generally accepted in Eur. *Hipp. 741*.

xiv. 10. The interpretation given to *πᾶρ χειρὸς* seems hardly possible. I would suggest, comparing *N. xi. 32*, *χειρὸς ἔλκων ὀπίσσω θυμὸς ἀτολμος ἔων* ('a faint heart dragging him back by the hand'),

*ὥς γ' ἄφαρ χειρὸς κυβερνᾶ-
ταὶ δικαίαισιν φρένεσσιν,*

'who straightway (whenever need of action arises) by a righteous spirit is guided by the hand.'

xvii. 90, 91. I would propose

*σθένει
νιν Βορέας ὀπιθεν ἐμπνέουσα ἄητα.*

This, a slight modification of Jebb's conjecture, is nearer to the MS., *COENENNIN* being very like *COEINEIN*, and it escapes the difficulty of taking *σθένει* to mean 'mightily.' The *νιν* is governed by *ἐμπνέουσα*, the *ἐμ-* of which fell out after *-εν* in *ὀπιθεν*. For *σθένει* 'was mighty,' 'blew strongly,' cp. *σθένουσα λαμπράς* 'burning brightly,' Aesch. *Ag. 296*. The resolution of the long syllable is frequent in this ode, occurring also in lines 5, 12, 14, 17, 20, 21. In defence of the adverbial use of *σθένει* might be urged verse 62 where the editor gives

δικὸν θράσει <τὸ> σῶμα πατρὸς [ἐς] δόμους,

and takes *θράσει* adverbially 'boldly.' I should much prefer to supply *σὺν* instead of *τὸ*. For the position of *σὺν* cp. Hom. *οἱ σὺν K. 19*, *ἐμοὶ σὺν ι. 332*, *Ἀρτέμιδι ξὺν ο. 410*, and *iv. 18* where *σὺν* certainly follows its case, and where we should perhaps read

ὠκυπόδεσσι δρόμοις σὺν ἵππων

or,

ὠκυπόδων στεφάνοις σὺν ἵππων

comparing for the latter Pind. *fr. 221* (Bgg.)

*ἀελλοπόδων μὲν τιν' εὐφραίνουσιν ἵππων
ἄνθεα καὶ στέφανοι.*

The prep. *σὺν* would have fallen out more easily than *τὸ* between *θράσει* and *σῶμα*, and its anomalous position would have contributed to that accident. A long syllable corresponds with a short several times in this ode, in which, as regards resolution too, the metre is laxer than usual.

xvii. 112. Why may not the corrupt

word represent an epithet, such as αἰόλαν? We might regard πορφύρεαν as a substantive, whether so written or changed to πορφύραν. It is to be scanned as a cretic however we write it.

xix. 7. For the metaphor in βάλλωσιν ἄμφι τιμάν cp. περιστέλλων αἰοιδάν I. i. 33.

xx. 8. After this line must have fallen out a verse such as

ὑπόπτερον ἄρμ' ὀπάσσας

In l. 11 perhaps we should read νῖ' Ἀφαρῆος.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

DISCOVERIES OF ROMAN REMAINS IN BRITAIN.—IV.

THE present article continues the series which I long ago began in this review, and contains the principal discoveries made since my last article (February, 1896). That article covered 1894 and 1895; I now approach 1896 and 1897.

Hadrian's Wall, between Newcastle and Carlisle, has witnessed much activity. The Newcastle Society of Antiquaries has continued its work at the fort of Aesica, a spot almost equidistant from Newcastle and Carlisle. Several probably second century inscriptions have been found and, in particular, two tombstones which the Romans appear to have brought in from the cemetery south of the fort and to have used in the construction or reconstruction of a building close to the centre of the fort. Several other cases are known of Roman tombstones being converted by the Romans into building material, although the act was illegal (*e.g.* *Digest* xlvii. 12, 4). In particular the North City Wall of Chester, which is Roman work, is full of tombstones dating probably from about A.D. 60 to 160. A building outside the fort at Aesica was also uncovered; it resembles in ground plan the buildings found outside almost every Roman fort and best explained as baths. A hoard of third century coins was found in this building, but very few smaller objects of importance were met with.

Simultaneously with the examination of Aesica, excavations were made by Prof. Pelham, myself, and others, principally in connection with the Cumberland Archaeological Society, with the object of elucidating the Vallum, that is, the two ramparts with a ditch between, which run side by side with the wall, about 30–1,300 yards south of it. The results were important. In the first place, it was found that in four cases the Vallum deviated or stopped to avoid the

site of a fort, and, as there is no discoverable contrary instance, it may be assumed that the Vallum and the forts are contemporary, or, at least, that the Vallum is not older than the forts. Evidence of various sorts seems to show that forts and wall are coeval, and the work of Hadrian, and we might, therefore, conclude that wall, forts and Vallum were all built by one Emperor, Hadrian.

Unfortunately, however, for this apparently satisfactory result, an element of uncertainty of a quite new kind has been introduced by another of our discoveries. At the fort of Amboglanna, near Gilsland, we found, in 1894, some traces of a turf-wall built with regularly laid sods. Further search in the last two years proves that this wall once ran right across the area of the fort, that is, that it represents an earlier frontier line than the existing wall and forts of stone. We were unable to ascertain whether an earlier earthen fort stood on the site of the fort now visible, nor could we trace the turf-wall—or rather its ditch, which was alone discoverable in many places,—for more than two miles, at each end of which distance it merged in the stone wall. We cannot, therefore, either assert or deny a theory which has been put forward, that the earliest frontier wall was of turf, and that later a stone wall was built upon the top of it and exactly along its line, except near Amboglanna. Should this theory be established it will become a question with which of the two walls we should connect the Vallum. As it is, we can only say that the two years' excavations have wholly altered the Mural Problems, as they were understood by Dr. Bruce.

North of the wall the Scotch Society of Antiquaries has been busy on two Roman forts, Birrens, near Ecclefechan, and Ardoch, a little north of Dunblane. Almost the whole of Birrens has been uncovered, the ground plan (of the normal type) ascertained, and several inscriptions found. Datable

objects seem to show that the fort was constructed about the middle of the second century and soon abandoned, probably in one of the numerous border wars which vexed second century Britain. Some sort of reoccupation in the fourth century is possible. At Ardoch the results have been less striking but no less interesting. The fort has always been famous for the imposing character of the deep concentric ditches which encircle it, and the Roman character of it had been known from a tombstone (*C.I.L.* vii. 1146), as well as from chance finds of coins (Trajan, Domitian, Pius), etc. The discoveries made by the Scotch excavators in 1896 were unexpected and perhaps unique. The whole interior of the fort was proved to be full of holes, generally just large enough to admit one's arm, and arranged in rows. Probably the buildings of the fort were principally of wood, and the holes represent the sockets of the most important uprights. The smaller objects found were of little importance. The general conclusion of the excavators was that the fort had only been occupied for a brief space or for two brief spaces, I suppose in the middle of the second century.

There is less to report from the south. At Chester a couple of dedications to the *genius* of (respectively) the Twentieth Legion and one of its centuries have been found accidentally, as well as a row or part of a row of columns which once fronted (it may be) some important part of the Praetorium. It is pleasant to be able to add that the owner of the property, Mr. Charles Brown, has taken excellent care of these discoveries.

At Silchester, the London Society of Antiquaries has continued its patient and admirable work of uncovering the whole of the ancient site. The task is not yet done; it is hardly half done, but every one must hope that it will be carried to its conclusion. The results, year by year, are not very sensational—ground plans of houses, systems of drains, gate-ways in the walls, and a great variety of smaller objects seldom possessing special importance. For example, the chief feature in the last season's work has been the examination of several wells constructed by sinking tubs. Some of these tubs (one or two with small inscriptions) have been rescued from below ground for preservation in the rapidly-growing Museum at Reading. The true importance of the work does not lie in these finds, interesting as they may sometimes be; it lies in the complete uncovering of the provincial town of Calleva, and the light thrown thereby on

the general condition of similar towns in southern Britain. In this connection it is almost as important to ascertain that a large area inside the walls is waste ground as to trace buildings. Not much light, I regret to say, has been thrown on the history of the place. The coins and pottery (I think) go to confirm my suggestion that it may have been founded, as a Romano-British town, by Agricola, but they do not exclude an earlier date.

Of accidental discoveries and smaller excavations there has been no lack in the last two years, but none of them can claim sufficient importance to be mentioned here. They confirm our knowledge of Roman Britain, but do not, as a rule, carry our horizon further, as the excavations which I have sketched may fairly be said to do. I may, however, just allude to the excavation of a small 'villa' at Appleshaw near Andover, where an inscription to Carinus has been found. In plan the 'villa' is said to resemble that at Carisbrooke in the Isle of Wight, and both belong probably to the end of the third century. The third and fourth centuries are, indeed, the period to which most Roman British 'villas' should be ascribed.

F. HAVERFIELD.

BACCHYLIDES AND THE FATE OF CROESUS.

THE version of the story of Croesus given by Bacchylides in Ode iii. is described by Mr. Kenyon as the earliest form of the legend, and the statement is correct in respect to literary tradition. It may be worth while, however, to recall the fact that a famous work of art, the red-figured amphora, No. 194 in the Louvre, published in the first volume of the *Monumenti dell' Istituto*, has been rightly held (by F. Koepp in von Sybel's *Historische Zeitschrift* for 1894, p. 442) to imply a version of the legend differing from that found in Herodotus. Here Croesus (ΚΡΟΕΣΟΣ), attired in royal robes, holding a sceptre in one hand, and pouring a libation from a *φιάλη* with the other, is seen seated upon a throne which is placed on an elaborately constructed pyre of logs (the *ξύλινος δόμος* of Bacchylides). A servant (Greek, not Persian in attire) is apparently kindling the pyre with two torches, though it must be admitted that the implements which he

applies to the logs are unlike the conventional torch. The name ΕΥΘΥΜΟΣ is attached to him. Koepp pointed out that the vase-painter clearly intended to convey the impression that Croesus, like Sardanapalus, sought a voluntary death on the pyre constructed by his own order. Whether the sequel of the story as Bacchylides relates it was also part of his belief must remain doubtful. The amphora is one of that class in which a small number of figures are represented on a large scale, and the artist in selecting a single moment from the story which he depicts is not tied to any special version of the dénouement. In the light of the ode of Bacchylides, however, it is hardly too bold a conjecture that the deliverance of Croesus would have formed the next scene in the story. The amphora is of the 'severe' style; after reading the ode of Bacchylides, I examined it, and found that the ends of the logs in the alternate layers of the pyre were painted in a purple 'engobe' over white, a survival of black-figure technique pointing to a relatively early date. It is therefore anterior by some decades at least to the poem of Bacchylides.

H. STUART JONES.

NOTES ARCHAEOLOGICAL AND MYTHOLOGICAL ON BACCHYLIDES.

ODE III. *The Croesus myth*.—It may be worth noting that light is thrown by the version of Bacchylides on the fine early R F vase published *Mon. dell. Inst.*, Pl. liv. In this beautiful design Croesus (inscribed) is enthroned on a pyre with more of the air of a triumphant king than a condemned prisoner; he pours libation from a phiale, and incidentally, or intentionally, his libation falls on the pyre at the moment of kindling; the fire is applied¹ to the pyre by a man (inscribed Εὐθύμος[s]) dressed not as a Persian but as an ordinary Greek slave. Croesus, too, wears Greek dress and is crowned—the Greek dress of the attendant is the more noticeable as on the reverse of the vase the capture of Antiope is represented and she is

in complete Oriental dress. The first commentator on the vase, the Duc de Luynes (*Annali*, 1833, p. 237), noted of course the discrepancies with the narrative of Herodotus, and in the manner of his time is driven to much needless symbolism in his attempt to account for it. But he hits the mark when he points out that about the historical facts of the life of Croesus had grown up a religious myth—'le mythe religieuse est bien différent' (p. 244, op. cit.). To be depicted on a vase at all is in itself tantamount to canonization; historical events are not made the subject-matter of vase paintings save in those rare instances where history is glorified by a halo of mythology, e.g. in the figures of Harmodios and Aristogeiton. It is not necessary, though possible, to suppose the vase painter directly inspired by Bacchylides, but he is inspired by the same religious and historical impulse—Croesus mounted the pyre of his own free will, his slave fired or sprinkled it and—Κροίσον ὁ χρυ[σός] φύλαξ Ἀπόλλων.

Ode XVII. *Theseus Minos and the ring*.—

As regards the interesting relation between Ode xvii. and the François vase, Mr. Kenyon perhaps goes a little far when he says (p. 157) 'it is difficult not to trace a direct indebtedness of the poet to the artist.' *vā* παρὰ λεπτόμενον φάνη is certainly tempting—the motive is obviously pictorial, but in the face of the subordinate position in Greek art occupied by ceramography direct indebtedness seems little likely. May not the pictorial touch be due to some more important work of art non-extant, from which the vase painter himself borrowed, possibly even the fresco of Mikon, so vaguely described by Pausanias? If Bacchylides borrowed direct from the vase painter such borrowing is a unicum.

Mythologically the version of this rare Theseus myth is of the first importance. Hitherto the Euphronios vase has been our earliest source for an important factor in the myth, i.e. the reception and recognition of Theseus by Amphitrite. How Mikon depicted the myth it is idle to conjecture, though Pausanias vaguely notes that the golden crown was Ἀμφιτρίτης δῶρον. Hyginus is more explicit. According to him Theseus is carried by dolphins to the Nereids and receives a crown from Thetis; he adds 'alii autem a Neptuni uxore acceperisse dicunt coronam,' and Mr. Kenyon notes that 'the mention of "alii" shows that he derived the story from various authorities, but among them, directly or indirectly, must have been Bacchylides.' The fact is now

¹ Baumeister (*Denkmäler*, p. 797) thinks that the objects held by Euthymos are not torches but *περιπαρτήρια*; he is not lighting the pyre but consecrating it with holy water. From the peculiar form of the supposed torches and the fact that the pyre is already burning freely in all directions the explanation seems probable and of course helps out the festal solemnity of the scene.

beyond doubt that the introduction of Amphitrite was not a mere whim of the artist but an integral part of the myth.

The importance of this factor can only be indicated here; even without the evidence of Bacchylides, it is one of those traits the authenticity of which is self-evident, because they serve no purpose in the story. It would have been much simpler for Poseidon to recognize his own son, and he certainly would have done it had he been on the spot. In a word the myth belongs to that early stratum of mythology when Poseidon was not yet god of the sea, or, at least, no-wise supreme there—Amphitrite and the Nereids ruled with their servants the Tritons. Even so late as the *Iliad* Amphitrite is not yet 'Neptuni uxor;' possibly the marriage was the work of the genealogy-maker, Hesiod. Later, anyhow,—as the Olympian system with its patriarchal tendencies came in,—she had to marry Poseidon as Hera had to marry Zeus—but there is always a sort of separateness about her kingdom. It is a matriarchal touch that sonship had to be acknowledged by the mother, though orthodox theology has made nonsense of it by turning her into a quasi-stepmother. The token of the ring is another matriarchal touch; it was originally, it appears, fastened on the breast of the child and would naturally be recognized by the mother. This has been pointed out by Bachofen in *Eustath. Hom.* p. 850. Needless to say Bacchylides is probably as unconscious of the import of his version as even the impartial Hyginus.

Two of the other vases cited by Mr. Kenyon adopt the orthodox patriarchal version—Poseidon replaces Amphitrite. In a third, the Bologna crater, the vase-painter halts, a Triton brings Theseus in his arms to Amphitrite, but Poseidon is present on a splendid couch, as spectator; in the background is the λεπτόπρυμνος ναῦς. It may be worth noting that in this late vase the scene is Apollonized by the orthodox addition of tripods and the chariot of the sun and sprays of laurel.

JANE E. HARRISON.

THE ARGIVE EXCLUSION OF ATTIC POTTERY.

HERODOTUS v. 88:

Καὶ πρὸς τὰτα ἐστὶ νόμος ποιεῖν εἶναι παρὰ σφίσι ἐκατέρωσι (the Argives and the Aeginetans). . . Ἀττικὸν δὲ μήτε τι ἄλλο

προσφέρειν πρὸς τὸ ἱδὸν μήτε κέραμον, ἀλλ' ἐκ χυτρίδων ἐπιχωρίων νόμον τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτοῖσι εἶναι πίνειν. The last part of the passage is repeated in Athenaeus, *Deipnosophistae*, 502, c.

The tale of which this passage forms a part, is one of the best known in Herodotus, from the archaeological standpoint. Through it we are enabled to establish a certain date for the change, at Athens, from the old Doric style of female dress to the Ionic, which dispensed with the *περόνη* or shoulder pin. It has also been frequently used to prove that the exportation of Attic vases to different parts of Greece was a great feature of Athenian commerce.

Since the completion of the excavation of the American School at the Argive Heraeum, under Professor Charles Waldstein, I have been engaged on the preparation of the vase fragments for the final publication. As they afford a striking proof of the correctness of Herodotus' story, as well as an accurate date for the passage of this embargo by Argos, it has seemed best not to delay the publication of this important fact.

Studniczka,¹ in his essay on the early Greek dress, has declared that the Athenian expedition against Aegina, which caused both the Aeginetans and the Argives to pass this act, must have fallen between the years 570-549. That Studniczka is absolutely correct in his statement the Argos vase fragments show. In the first place, it was noticed from the very beginning of the excavation that fragments representing the black- and red-figure styles were extremely scarce, in contrast to the elder varieties such as Mycenaean, Geometric, and Proto-Corinthian. The further classification of the fragments in the Museum at Athens made this all the more apparent. I should estimate that the total number of black-figure fragments hardly filled two baskets,² while the number of red-figure fragments *did not exceed fifty* specimens. No single vase could be reconstructed from the fragments of either style, although several fragments clearly belonged to the same vase. In the red-figure style we may say roughly that between two and three dozen vases were represented.

A study of Attic vase painting during the middle of the sixth century shows us that the black-figure style was in full swing, but that the great masters of the technique, Exekias, Taleides, Andokides, etc., were not yet in their prime. It was the period of

¹ *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Altgriechischen Tracht*, p. 7.

² The baskets used throughout the excavations were about 30 cm. high.

Nikosthenes and the 'Little Masters' group, and before 550 none of the real *chef-d'oeuvres* of the black-figure style had made their appearance. The red-figure style is not introduced until some twenty years later, and all its finest work falls in the period between the end of the century and the beginning of the Persian wars. Now an examination of the fragments representing the two styles at the Heraeum reveals the following facts: first, that of the scanty number of black-figure fragments, barely half a dozen belong to the best period (*i.e.* after the middle of the sixth century); secondly, we have about the same amount of the red-figure fragments prior to the Persian wars. Thus we have a period of seventy years, from 550-480, represented by about twelve fragments or so of what was then the most important ware in all Greece.

That the cause of this lack of Attic ware was the embargo of the Argives, is too plain to be doubted; and the further conclusion is forced upon us that the period of seventy years referred to was the duration of this measure, since almost all the black-figure fragments are prior to 550 and almost all the red-figure later than 480. That any fragments should be found at all within this period is no proof against the existence of the embargo. No such measure can be absolute, and it would be too much to expect that, no matter how rigorous the customs were, they should have succeeded during a period of seventy years in preventing the importation of a single Attic vase into Argos. It cannot be said with certainty that this embargo was removed after 480, but such is probably the case; Argos, though remaining neutral during the Persian wars, would hardly have enforced a discriminatory measure against the chief Greek state at the time of her sorest need. Moreover, though the number of fragments of the red-figure style later than the Persian wars is scanty, still enough are preserved to show that if the measure existed, it was not so rigorous as in the earlier days.

Thus the fragments found at Argos appear to confirm the statement of Herodotus that the Argives forbade the importation of Attic vases, and that such a law must have been passed about 560-550 B.C.

JOSEPH CLARK HOPPIN.

MONTHLY RECORD.

BRITAIN.

Appleshaw, near Andover.—Between thirty and forty Romano-British pewter vessels (large circular dishes, bowls, cups, jugs, platters, etc.) have been

found on the supposed site of a Roman villa. Most of the dishes have incised central ornaments resembling the designs of late mosaic pavements.¹

ITALY.

Palustrina.—Two fresh fragments of the Praenestine Calendar of M. Verrius Flaccus have come to light. The better preserved contains the religious observances for August 1, viz., a sacrifice in the Forum Olitorium, and another (hitherto unknown) to Victoria Virgo on the Palatine Hill.²

Boscovale.—Not far from the villa where the great hoard of plate was recently found, the remains of another villa have been excavated. It is divided into two parts, one for the proprietor, the other for the farmer. There are a number of wall-paintings, chiefly landscapes and sea-pieces. One represents a country house near a river with an angler fishing from a bridge. In another is a small village on the sea-shore; near the houses rises a pyramid, which is thought to indicate Graeco-Egyptian influence. There are also a number of groups of plants, flowers, animals, birds and fishes, and the *torcularium* (where the wine was prepared) an appropriate representation of Silenus and Bacchus with a panther. The *cella vinaria* contained four large *dolia*. Another room seems from its graffiti, in which corn and beans are mentioned, to have been used as a granary. Seven skeletons were found.³

SICILY.

Buscemi (Eastern Sicily).—Three grottoes have been discovered with Greek graffiti relating to *ephebi*. The grottoes were presumably connected with a gymnasium or college of *ephebi*, like a similar cave on Santorin, formerly supposed to be a sanctuary of Poseidon.⁴

GREECE.

Thermon (Aetolia).—The ruins south of Kephalyro have been excavated by the Greek Archaeological Society, with the result of confirming Lolling's suggestion that they represent the ancient Thermon. There exists a quadrangular Altis (346 m. by 200 m.) with a wall 2'60 m. thick, built of large stones. Of the inscriptions proving the identification of the site, one records a treaty with Philip V., with the proviso that a *stelé* should be set up at both Thermon and Delphi; another mentions *Ἀγέλαος ὁ Ναυάρχης*, strategos of the Aetolian League. Within the Altis is the Assembly-hall of the League, with a frontage of 130 m., and 30 monuments with inscriptions. In the neighbourhood a great number of objects were found, including some bases of statues, one of which mentions an artist Herakleides. The site has remained undisturbed since the destruction of the place by Philip in 218 B.C.⁵

Thermopylae.—The ancient remains discovered during the late war have been examined by the French School. They comprise a watch-tower 8 m. square, of the time of the Persian wars, commanding one of the mountain-paths which turned the pass in the rear; and a necropolis, probably of Hellenistic origin, but proved by the discovery of a Delphian coin of Imperial date to have been used in the Roman age. The tombs were cut in the soft rock about a mile from the warm springs, and contained common unpainted pottery and iron arms.¹

¹ *Athen.* 27 Nov. 1897.

² *Athen.* 8 Jan.

³ *Athen.* 13 Nov. 1897.

⁴ *Athen.* 18 Dec. 1897.

⁵ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 11 Dec. 1897.

ISLANDS.

Paros, Antiparos, Despotiko.—Tsundas has excavated about 180 prehistoric graves on these islands, as well as some houses, also prehistoric, and said to be earlier than any others yet discovered. The finds include terracotta and marble vases, marble statuettes, and necklaces of stone pearls and obsidian chips.¹

G. F. HILL.

Revue Numismatique. Part iii. 1897.

Th. Reinach. 'Un nouveau roi de Bithynie.' Reinach shows that the 'King Nicomedes, son of King Nicomedes' mentioned in a Delphic inscription, published in *Revue des et. grecques* viii. 451, is a new king of Bithynia, Nicomedes Euergetes, son of Nicomedes II. Epiphanes and father of Nicomedes Philopator, hitherto called Nicomedes III. The place of this new Nicomedes, as king of Bithynia, is between Nicomedes II. and 'III.' He probably died circ. B.C. 94, and some years of the long reign hitherto assigned to Nicomedes II. really belong to Nicomedes Euergetes. A passage in Licinianus and various inscriptions throw light on the new king who was celebrated for his liberality and made gifts to Delphi, Delos, etc. Pliny, *H.N.* vii. 127; xxxvi. 21 refers to this Nicomedes rather than to Nicomedes Philopator 'III.' A list of the kings of Pontus on

¹ *Athen.* 1 Jan.

p. 258 of this paper deserves notice.—E. Babelon. 'La Collection Waddington au Cabinet des Médailles: Inventaire sommaire' (with three plates). The first instalment of a useful inventory of the Waddington collection which is now finally deposited in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The inventory gives the inscriptions and brief descriptions of the types, but further details are reserved for publication in Waddington's *Recueil général des Monnaies grecques de l'Asie Mineure* which will be printed by the Academy of Inscriptions.—J. Rouvier. 'Note sur un poids antique de Béryste.' A leaden weight with type, trident and the inscription, ΛΔΠΡ (year 184 of Seleucid Era=128 B.C.) ΝΙΚΩΝΟΣ ΑΓΟ-ΠΑΝΟ(ΜΟΥ).

Numismatic Chronicle. Part iii. 1897.

E. J. Seltman. 'The type known as "the Demos" on coins of Rhegium.' The 'Demos' explanation is, no doubt, as Mr. Seltman argues, by no means free from objection. Mr. Seltman would explain the figure as Aristaeus, but the weak point in his paper is that he brings forward no corroborative evidence whatever to prove that Aristaeus was worshipped at Rhegium: such evidence is the more desirable because this alleged representation of Aristaeus is not one of the known representations of the god, and the symbols which Mr. Seltman would identify as his attributes are susceptible of other explanations.—J. P. Six. 'Monnaies grecques, inédites et incertaines' (continued). Sardis, Side, Golgoi, Cyrene, etc.

WARWICK WROTH.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Vol. 52, 3. 1897.

Latinoische Übersetzungen aus der Aratusliteratur. M. Manitius. These translations are given from Cod. Dresdensis Dc. 188 with various readings from the other MSS. in which the same are found. *Die Exostra des griechischen Theaters.* A. Körte. Though the precise nature of this contrivance is disputed, yet its existence cannot be doubted. *Antiker Volksglaube.* W. Kroll. (1) On the souls of the dead passing into the bodies of the new-born. (2) On cynanthropy and lycanthropy. (3) On the names of the dead being changed to avoid evil spirits. *Lucubrationum Posidonianarum Specimen* ii, E. Martini. Part of this is a reply to Maass' criticism of the writer's dissertation *Quaestiones Posidonianae. Lebbe Erasistratos in Alexandria?* R. Fuchs. Maintains against Susemihl (*Gesch. Griech. Lit.* i. d. Alexandrinerzeit) that Er. lived at Alexandria the latter part of his life, which is also the received opinion. *Altes Latein.* F. Buecheler. On *fovere* and *favere*: marks on *tesserae*: *aplopodite* the name of a drinking-vessel: the meaning of *praestare*. *Euphronien.* P. Stengel. On von Prott's article in the last number [*Cl. Rev.* xi. 323]. *Studien zur Geschichte der griechischen Rhetorik* i. and ii., L. Radermacher. (1) On Timaeus and the tradition of the origin of Rhetorik. (2) Plutarch's work *De se ipso citra invidiam laudando.* Zur lateinischen Wortbildungslehre, M. Pokrowskij. (1) *Serenus, crudelis.* (2) *Defraudil.* (3) Verbs compounded

with the negative *in.* Zu *Pseudo-Kallisthenes und Julius Valerius*, A. Ausfeld.

MISCELLAN. *Zwei Vermuthungen zu der Schrift περί ὕψους.* W. Schmid. Zu dem *Lexicon Messanense de iola adscripto*, R. Schneider. Some corrections to Rabe's article in vol. 47. Zu *Cicero ad. fam.* viii. 17, 2, J. Ziehen. For *†Arruntanus Cato* proposes *astutia!* nun me *Catonem?* Zu *Horat.* *Carm.* ii. 6, A. Frederking. Dates this B.C. 27. *Eine Zeitbeziehung in der ersten Mäcenaselegie.* J. Ziehen. *Nemesians Iacutica.* M. Ihm. *Ueber Entstehung von neuen Verwandtschaftsnamen aus alten im Latein.* A. Zimmermann. *Mars Mullo, Mars Vicinus und drei pagi der Redones.* M. Ihm. On three inscr. discovered at Rennes. *Ein inschriftliches Beispiel von Kolometrie.* C. Wachsmuth. *Eigennamen in griechischen Inschriften.* W. Schwarz.

Vol. 52, 4. 1897.

Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Philo. P. Wendland. *Zur lateinischen und griechischen Etymologie.* M. Niedermann. (1) On *-per* in the adverbs *aliquantisper, nuper, parumper*, etc. (2) On Βελλεπορόντης. *Die Composition der Chorlieder Senecas.* F. Leo. These give a proof of the continued connexion of the chorus with the tragedy up to late times. *Der Korinthische Bund.* J. Kaerst. An account of the federation founded by Philip after Chaeronea. Zu *Pseudokallisthenes und Julius Valerius*, ii., A. Ausfeld. Critical notes continued from last no. *Das afrikanische Latein.* W. Kroll.

Archaisms, vulgarisms, Graecisms and syntactical peculiarities from Apuleius, Tertullian, etc. *Ueber die Schriftstellerei des Klaudius Galenus*, iv., J. Ilberg. On the non-medical works of Galen, chiefly philosophical [see Cl. Rev. x. 223].

MISCELLAN. *Varia*, L. Rademacher. On Plaut. Stich. 270, 271: Varr. Sat. Menipp. fr. 384: Prop. iv. 1, 7 in l. 12 reads *meat* for *meas*; resemblances between *Aetna* and the Greek writer Conon of the first cent. B.C.: the *Cynegetica* of Gratinus. *Ueber Beziehungen zwischen Isocrates, Lobrede auf Helena und Platons Symposion*, K. Lüdtke. *Ein neues Aischioscital*, A. Brinkmann. Two references to this dialogue given from a Byzantine writer [see Cl. Rev. x. 361]. *εἶσα vorn, ἔω hinten*, R. Fuchs. This sense of the words is common in medical writers. *ἀνάρπιστα, ὁπίσθεν*, L. Rademacher.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik. Vol. 155. Part 3. 1897.

Das Schlachtfeld im Teutoburger walde ii., A. Wilms. Concluded from the last no. [Cl. Rev. sup. p. 369]. The town of Detmold is built on the site of the battle. *Τετράμωρον*, F. Hultsch. *Die Entstehung des Thukydideischen geschichtswerkes*, G. Friedrich. An attempt to date the composition of various books. *Etymologie und begriffsbestimmung einzelner Homerischer wörter*, J. Oertner. On ἀμφί-λυσσα, ἑλικῶς, εἰλιπρόδες ἔλικες, ἀπρόγες, ταηλεγής, δυσηλεγής, ἀπηλεγέως, ταναόσους, τανόγλυσσος, τανύ-περος, τανύσφυρος, τανύφλοιος, τανύφυλλος, and τώροψ. *Textkritisches zur consolatio ad Liviam*, J. Ziehen. *Zu Platons Sophistes*, K. J. Liebhold. Critical notes. *Zu Platons Hippias dem grössern*, K. J. Liebhold. Critical notes. *Zu Caesar de bello Gallico*, J. H. Schmalz. Defends the text in various places against R. Schneider and Meusel. *Die erzählung von dem orakel der Celeno in Vergils Aeneis*, K. Fulda. *Zu lateinischen grammatik und stilistik*, P. Stamm. On *cum quidem*: on the doctrine of the ablative: the attraction of a pronoun to the gender of the predicate: *scimus* = 'we know' in historical narrative: the position of *et* epexegetic: primary sequence after historic tenses: the form *urum fuisse* in the apodosis of unreal conditions in *orat. obl.* *Zu Ovidius Metamorphosen*, L. Polster. In xiii. 294 reads *diversosque urbes* and in ib. 794 *farno* for *forma*.

Parts 4, 5. *Der bogenschwertkampf in der Odyssee*, A. Ruppersberg. In φ 421, 422 takes *στελεῖς* as object of *ἡβροτε* and *πρότης* as partitive gen. *Zu Appianus*, E. Schwabe. In Syr. 55 proposes Ἀρείων for Ἀραβίων. *Die entstehung des Thukydideischen geschichtswerkes*, G. Friedrich. Concluded from last no. Thuc. wrote the Archidamian war first, and published it about 418, then the Sicilian war, then

supplemented his account by the years 421-415, and finally the eighth book. He died soon after 404 without revising his work. *Zu Sophokles Aias*, F. Polle. On various passages [Cl. Rev. xi. 175]. *Die schuld der Sophokleischen Antigone*, E. R. Gast. *Kallimachos und die nomosfrage*, C. Steinweg. An arrangement of the hymns to bring them within the rules of the nome. *Zu Aischylos Choëphoren*, K. Frey. On Cho. 917 with reference to Dr. Verrall's note. *Zu den κερτοί des Julius Africanus*, F. Rühl. A critical note. *Zur topographie des punischen Karthago*, O. Meltzer. *De Donati commento in Terentium specimen observationum primum*, P. Rabow. *Lateinische etymologien*, O. Keller. On *Palatium*, *Inchoare*, *Multa* and *Multus*, *Provincia*. *Zum edictum Diocletiani*, W. Heraeus. An examination of the Latin and Greek glosses. *Quellen-kritisches zu Vitruvius*, M. Thiel. Posidonius is the source of the astronomical details of the ninth book.

Part 6. *Zu Euripides Hippolytos*, J. Oeri. Chiefly on the responson-system in this play. *Zu Ciceros briefen an Atticus*, W. Sternkopf. On ii. 1, 5. *Das geburtsjahr Theokrits*, R. Helm. Puts it B.C. 305-300. Susemihl says 315-312. *Zur textkritik des Lukianos*, P. R. Müller. *Zu den ps.-Platonischen dialogen Alkibiades I. und II.*, K. J. Liebhold. Critical notes. *Zu Plautus Miles gloriosus*, A. Fleckeisen. On ll. 771 foll. *Zum Strategikos der Onesandros*, R. Vári. On i. 13. *Macer und Tubero*, i.-iv., W. Soltau. It is more and more seen that out of the great number of annalists Livy only used a few. In the first decade Macer and Tubero are his chief authorities for the constitutional struggles. *Zu Cornelius Nepos*, L. Polster. In Dion i. 4 proposes *tenuabat* for *tenebat* of MSS. [see Cl. Rev. x. 77].

Part 7. *Aristotelis ethicorum Nicomacheorum libri in capita i., ii., iii., quae sunt de liberalitate enarrantur*, R. Noetel. *Der begriff des wissen vom wissen in Platons Charmides und seine bedeutung für das ergebnis des dialoges*, C. Schirlitz. *Zu Sophokles Antigone und Platons Protagoras*, F. Blass. Defends the MSS. *νόμος παρὲς ὅρων* in Antig. 368 by a comparison with Pl. Prot. 322c, etc. *Sokrates und Xenophon*, iii., K. Lincke. On Book IV. of the *Memorabilia* [see Cl. Rev. xi. 84]. *Zu Ovidius metamorphosen*, Ph. Loewe. In iii. 29 reads *a culmine* and in 33 *quo conditus antro*. *Zu Platons Symposion*, K. J. Liebhold. Critical notes. *Zu Platons Gorgias*, K. J. Liebhold. Critical notes. *Das schema Pindaricum bei Platon*, O. Wilpert. Maintains that there are no real exx. of this figure in Plato. *Emendationen zu Domninos*, F. Hultsch. *Zu Plinius naturalis historia*, K. Mayhoff. Defends his reading in xviii. 146 in his edition of 1892.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

Aristophanes. The Wasps, with introduction, metrical analysis, critical notes, and commentary by W. J. M. Starkie. 12mo. 546 pp. Macmillan & Co. 6s.
Aristoteles. Loos (I.) The political philosophy of Aristotle. 8vo. 21 pp. Philadelphia, Academy of Political and Social Science. 25 c.
NO. CII. VOL. XII.

Bacchylides. Poems, from a Papyrus in the British Museum, edited by F. G. Kenyon. 8vo. Frowde. 5s.
— the same. An autotype facsimile. Folio. 20 plates. Frowde. £1 1s.
Catullus. The Lesbia, arranged and translated by J. H. A. Tremenhore. Crown 8vo. 174 pp. Unwin. 6s.

- Cebetis Tabula*, with introduction and notes by C. J. Jerram. Abridged edition. Crown 8vo. Frowde. 1s. 6d.
- Cicero*. Selected letters, with introduction and notes by F. F. Abbott. 12mo. 76, 315 pp. Boston, Ginn. \$1.35.
- Demosthenes*. Meidias, with introduction, analysis, notes, and index by C. A. M. Fennell. Crown 8vo. 156 pp. Clive. 5s.
- Fulleylove* (J.) Pictures of classic Greek landscape and architecture. Text by H. W. Nevinson. Imperial 4to. 94 pp., plates. Dent. £1 11s. 6d.
- Harington* (K. P.) Greek and Roman mythology. 16mo. New York, Leach. \$1.
- Homerus*. Butler (S.) The authoress of the *Odyssey*: where and when she wrote, who she

- was, the use she made of the *Iliad*, etc. Royal 8vo. 292 pp. Longmans. 10s. 6d.
- Horner* (S.) Greek vases: historical and descriptive notices of vases in the Museum of the Louvre and in the British Museum. With preface by A. S. Murray. Crown 8vo. 192 pp. Sonnenschein. 3s. 6d.
- Plato*. Lutoslawski (W.) The origin and growth of Plato's Logic, with an account of Plato's style and of the chronology of his writings. 8vo. Longmans. £1 1s.
- Potter* (G. S.) The founders of Rome. 12mo. 6, 28 pp. Buffalo, Peter and Paul Co. 25 c.
- Woodhouse* (W. J.) Aetolia. Its geography, topography, antiquities. Royal 8vo. 414 pp., engravings, maps. Frowde. £1 1s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Aristoteles*. Aumüller (J.) Vergleichung der drei Aristotelischen Ethiken hinsichtlich ihrer Lehre über die Willensfreiheit. 8vo. 37 pp. München.
- Bursy (B.) De Aristotelis πολιτείας 'Αθηναίων partis alterius fonte et auctoritate. 8vo. viii, 148 pp. Dorpat.
- Vahlen (J.) Hermeneutische Bemerkungen zu Aristoteles Poetik. 8vo. 18 pp. Berlin.
- Augustinus*. Ohlmann (D.) De S. Augustini dialogis in Cassiciaco scriptis. 8vo. 80 pp. Strassburg.
- Borchardt* (L.) Ueber das Alter des Sphinx bei Gisch. 8vo. 9 pp., engraving. Berlin.
- Cicero*. Oratio in Verrem de suppliciis. Texte accompagné d'une introduction, d'un commentaire explicatif et de notes critiques par P. Monet. Crown 8vo. 182 pp. Paris, Colin.
- Haccius (O.) Gliederung der ersten catilinarischen Rede Ciceros. 4to. 106 pp. Weissenburg.
- Cinquini* (Ad.) Observationes in varios scriptores: scriptores graeci. 8vo. 20 pp. Florence, Landi.
- Codices graeci et latini photographice depicti duce* Scatone de Vries Bibliothecario. Tom. II.: Codex Bernensis 363, Augustini de dialectica et de rhetorica libros, Bedae historiae ecclesiasticae librum I., Horatii carmina, Ovidii metamorphoseon fragmenta, Servii et aliorum opera grammatica continens. Cum praefatione H. Hagen. Folio. v, lxxi. pp. and 394 pp. of facsimile. Leiden, Sijthoff. 200 Mk.
- Columella*. Becher (W.) De Lucii Junii Moderati Columellae vita et scriptis. 8vo. 82 pp. Leipzig.
- Curtius* (E.) Christ (W.) Nekrolog auf Ernst Curtius. 8vo. 4 pp. München.
- Damascius*. Chaignet (A. E.) Damascius. Fragment de son commentaire par la troisième hypothèse du Parménide. 8vo. 42 pp. Paris, Leroux.
- Empedokles*. Diels (H.) Ueber ein Fragment des Empedocles. 8vo. 12 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf.
- (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akademie der Wissensch.')
- Euripides*. Wecklein (N.) Beiträge zur Kritik des Euripides. 8vo. 52 pp. München.
- Fegerl* (Joh.) Die physikalischen Kenntnisse der Alten, entnommen den wichtigsten Autoren. (Continuation.) 8vo. 30 pp. Kremsier, Gusek. 1 Mk.
- Firmicus*. Moore (C. H.) Julius Firmicus Maternus, der Heide und der Christ. 8vo. 51 pp. München.
- Floss* (A.) De collegiis invenum quaestiones epigraphicae. 8vo. 37 pp. Erlangen.
- Furtwängler* (A.) Sogenanntes 'Todtenmahl'-Relief mit Inschrift.—Zur Venus von Milo. 8vo. 20 pp. München.
- Goedeckemeyer* (Alb.) Epicurus Verhältniss zu Demokrit in der Naturphilosophie. 8vo. 137 pp. Strassburg, Trübner. 4 Mk.
- Hiller von Gaertringen* (F. Frhr. v.) Die archaische Cultur der Insel Thera. 8vo. 33 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 60 Pf.
- Hirschfeld* (O.) Die Haeduer und Averner unter römischer Herrschaft. 8vo. 21 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk.
- (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akademie der Wissensch.')
- Hoffmann* (O.) Die griechischen Dialekte in ihrem historischen Zusammenhang. Vol. III. Der ionische Dialekt. Quellen und Lautlehre. 8vo. x, 626, 20 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & R. 16 Mk.
- Homerus*. Bertrin (G.) La question homérique: Variétés littéraires. Crown 8vo. 338 pp. Paris, Poussielgue.

- Horatius Werke.* Herausgegeben von O. Henke und C. Wagner. Vol. I. Oden und Epoden. Einleitung und Text von O. Henke. 8vo. viii, 286 pp., 3 maps. Bremen, Heinsius. 3 Mk.
- Jahresbericht über classische Altertumswissenschaft. Index to Vols. 1-87. Parts 2 and 3. 8vo. Berlin, Calvary. Each part 2 Mk. 40.
- Karels (J.)* Le destin et la mort dans la tragédie grecque. 4to. 64 pp. Luxemburg.
- Klein (W.)* Praxiteles. 8vo. viii, 448 pp., numerous engravings. Leipzig, Veit & Co. 20 Mk.
- Kekulé von Stradonitz (R.)* Ueber Copien einer Frauenstatue aus der Zeit des Phidias. 4to. 38 pp., 10 engravings and 5 plates. (Berliner Winckelmannfest-Programm Nr. 57.) Berlin, Reimer. 6 Mk.
- Körber (K.)* Römische Inschriften des Mainzer Museums. Dritter Nachtrag zum Becker'schen Katalog. 8vo. 66 pp., engravings. Mainz.
- Kroehnert (O.)* Canones ne poetarum scriptorum artificium per antiquitatem fuerunt? 8vo. iii, 67 pp. Königsberg. 2 Mk.
- Krumbacher (K.)* Kasia. 8vo. 65 pp., 2 plates. München.
- Limes (der obergermanisch-rätische) des Römerreiches. Im Auftrag der Reichs-Limes-Commission herausgegeben von O. v. Sarwey und F. Hettner. Part VIII. 4to. 10, 16, 10 pp., engravings, and 9 plates. Heidelberg, Petters. 4 Mk.
- Livius.* Soltan (W.) Livius' Geschichtswerk seine Komposition und seine Quellen. 8vo. viii, 224 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 6 Mk.
- Lucani Pharsalia.* Cum commentario critico ed. C. M. Francken. Vol. II. (Libri VI.-X.) 8vo. xiv, 276 pp. Leiden, Sijthoff. 9 Mk. 60.
- Ménandre.* Nicole (Jul.) Le laboureur de Ménandre. Fragments inédits sur papyrus d'Égypte, déchiffrés, traduits et commentés. 8vo. 79 pp. Basel, Georg. 2 Mk.
- Mittheilungen des kais. Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, athenische Abtheilung. Vol. XXII. 4 parts. 8vo. (Parts I. II. 232 pp., 7 plates.) Athens. 12 Mk.
- Moritz (H.)* Die Zunamen bei den byzantinischen Historikern und Chronisten. I. Teil. 8vo. 55 pp. Landshut.
- Olympia.* Die Ergebnisse der vom Deutschen Reiche veranstalteten Ausgrabungen. Herausgegeben von E. Curtius und F. Adler. I. Textband und Karten und Pläne (in Portfolio), completing the work. Text by F. Adler, E. Curtius, W. Doerpfeld, P. Gräf, J. Patsch, R. Weil. 4to. xi, 154 pp. 15 Mk.—Karten und Pläne. Folio. 12 maps, 1 plate. Berlin, Asher. 35 Mk.
- Pappritz (Rich.)* Anleitung zum Studium der klassischen Philologie und Geschichte. 8vo. 48 pp. Berlin, Füssinger. 75 Pf.
- Phaedrus.* Zander (C. M.) De generibus et libris paraphrasium Phaedrianarum. 4to. 42 pp. Lund. 1 Mk. 65.
- Philo.* Wendland (P.) Eine doxographische Quelle des Philo. 8vo. 6 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 50 Pf. (Aus 'Sitzungsberichte der k. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften').
- Plautus.* Esch (J.) De Plauti corruptione secundae syllabae vocabulorum polysyllaborum, quae mensura jambica incipiunt. 8vo. 116 pp. Münster.
- Hasper (Th.) De compositione Militis Gloriosi commentatio, cum emendationibus. 4to. 28 pp. Dresdae. 1 Mk.
- (From 'Commentationes congressui philologorum Dresdensi dedicatae').
- Plutarchus.* Dyroff (A.) Die Tierpsychologie des Plutarchos von Chaironeia. 8vo. 59 pp. Würzburg.
- Procopius.* Eisenhofer (L.) Procopius von Gaza. 8vo. 84 pp. München.
- Reich (F.)* De compositione epiirrhematica. 8vo. 43 pp. Strassburg.
- Robert (C.)* Die antiken Sarkophag-Reliefs. Im Auftrag des kais. Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, mit Benutzung der Vorarbeiten von Fr. Matz herausgegeben und bearbeitet. Vol. III. Einzelmythen. Part I. Aktaeon—Hercules. folio. vi, 168 pp., engravings and 43 plates. Berlin, Grote. 160 Mk.
- Schulten (Ad.)* Die Lex Manciana, eine afrikanische Domänenordnung. 4to. 51 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk. 50.
- (Aus 'Abhandlungen der k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen').
- Sculpturen (Antike)* aus den kgl. Museen zu Berlin. Vol. I. folio. 75 plates. With letterpress in 8vo. (19 pp.) Berlin, Graph. Gesellschaft. 135 Mk.
- Sophocles.* Hintner (F.) Der Pflichtenstreit der Agamemnonskinder in Sophocles Electra und seine Lösung. 2 pts. 8vo. 34, 18 pp. Laibach. 1 Mk.
- Stachelin (F.)* Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater bis zur Errichtung der römischen Provinz Asia. 8vo. 104 pp. Basel.
- Stahlecker.* Ueber die verschiedenen Versuche der Rekonstruktion der attischen Triere. 4to. 38 pp., 3 plates. Ravensburg.
- Stesichorus.* Pauleke (M.) De tabula iliaca quaestiones Stesichoreae. 8vo. 109 pp. Regimontii. 2 Mk. 50.
- Tertullianus.* Einstiedler (P. J. M.) De Tertulliani adversus Iudaeos libro. 8vo. 44 pp. Würzburg.
- Hoppe (H.) De sermone Tertulliano quaestiones selectae. 8vo. 84 pp. Marburg.
- Wolf (P.) Die Stellung des Christen zu den Schauspielen nach Tertullians Schrift de spectaculis. 8vo. 90 pp. Leipzig.
- Theophanes.* Krumbacher (K.) Eine neue Vita des Theophanes Confessor. 8vo. 29 pp. München.
- Thiele (G.)* De antiquorum libris pietis capita quatuor. 8vo. iii, 44 pp. Marburg, Elwert. 1 Mk.
- Thierfelder (A.)* System der altgriechischen Instrumentalnotenschrift. 8vo. 33 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 75 Pf.

Thucydides. Histoire de la guerre du Péloponnèse.

Traduction nouvelle avec une introduction et des

notes par E. A. Bétant. 12 mo. viii, 595 pp.

Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

— Lange (Edm.) Die Arbeiten zu Thukydides

seit 1890. Eine kritische Uebersicht. Part I.

8vo. 56 pp. Leipzig, Dieterich. 1 Mk. 20.

(Aus 'Philologus'.)

Usener (H.) Der Stoff des griechischen Epos. 8vo.

63 pp. Wien.

Wachsmuth (C.) Ueber Ziele und Methoden der

griechischen Geschichtschreibung. 4to. 19 pp.

Leipzig, Edelmann. 75 Pf.

Wellmann (M.) Kratenas. 4to. 32 pp., 2 plates.

Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk.

(Aus 'Abhandlungen der k. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen'.)

Wilcken (U.) Die griechischen Papyrus-Urkunden.

8vo. 59 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 1 Mk.

Wikowski (Stan.) Prodromus grammaticae papy-

rorum graecorum aetatis Lagidarum. 8vo. 65 pp.

Krakau. 3 Mk.

Xenophon. Kimmich (J.) Xenophon quare com-

mentariorum Socraticorum librum composuerit

quartum, et qua ratione eius libri argumenta

cohaereant, quaeratur. 8vo. 61 pp. Würzburg.